

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XII.—No. 47.

JULY, 1936.

JONSON'S MARRIAGE

BY MARK ECCLES

BEN JONSON as a man stands out far more clearly than any other Elizabethan dramatist. He displayed his character in his plays and, still better, in his poems. He made a stronger impression upon the educated men of his time than did either Shakespeare or Donne. No contemporary writer acquired more enemies, and few had more friends. Above all, his spoken words were set down by Drummond of Hawthornden—that forerunner of Boswell who put posterity more deeply in his debt by questioning Jonson and recording what he said than by all his own writings. Jonson, in consequence, is the one dramatist of Shakespeare's time whose personality a biographer can hope to recapture: the "mountain belly" and the "face like a rotten russet apple when 'tis bruised," the "thorny-toothed" pugnacity of the fearless satirist, "a great lover and praiser of himself, a contemner and scorner of others," "passionately kind and angry," who of all styles "loved most to be named honest" and "never esteemed of a man for the name of a lord," who drank out all the full cup of wine in token of his reconciliation with the Church of England, and talked with his friends over many a cup of rich canary at the Mermaid and the Devil.

And yet for the early years of Jonson's life there have been found none of those definite records which exist with unusual completeness (contrary to popular belief) for Shakespeare. Many documents

have survived concerning Shakespeare's parents, but not even the names of Jonson's father and mother. Precise dates can be given for Shakespeare's baptism at Stratford, his marriage licence at Worcester, the christenings of his three children, his residence in the parish of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, in Southwark, and in Silver Street. The biographers of Jonson, on the other hand, have been unable to tell when and where he was born, when and where he was married, what was the name of his wife, or the number of his children. Indeed, no record of Jonson has been unearthed earlier than July, 1597, when he first makes his appearance in Henslowe's Diary, at the age of twenty-five.

Whoever undertakes to tell the story of Jonson's life, therefore, finds great gaps in the necessary framework of facts which can be filled only by thorough search of the extant records. The following pages discuss a few pieces of fresh evidence on such problems in Jonson's biography as his marriage, children, and residences in London.

I

The parish register of St. Magnus the Martyr by London Bridge contains the following entry for November 14, 1594 :

Beniamine Johnson and Anne Lewis married.

In all the London parish registers which I have examined, this is the only marriage of a Benjamin Johnson during the reign of Elizabeth.

If "Beniamine Johnson" is the dramatist, as the date strongly suggests, then here is the name of the woman who, among all the wives of Elizabethan poets, comes most suddenly to life for us, through Ben's famous description of her to Drummond : "a shrew yet honest." That single phrase gives a clearer picture of her than documents and monumental verses give of Shakespeare's wife Anne. The register of St. Magnus, which I have examined from its beginning in 1557 to 1620, makes no further mention of Benjamin Johnson or Anne (Lewis) Johnson. There are the usual number of other Johnsons ; a Davye Lewis who married Elizabeth Askew, August 18, 1588 ; and a William Lewis, "servant of M^r Weblines," buried May 23, 1597.¹ Anne Lewis, if she was a parishioner of St. Magnus,

¹ For courteous permission to search the registers of St. Magnus and of St. Michael in Crooked Lane, I am indebted to the Rector of St. Magnus, the Rev.

may have lived on London Bridge, which constituted the greatest part of the parish. It is interesting to notice (though, of course, I base no argument upon it) that, according to E. H. Sugden, *A Topographical Dictionary to the Works of Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists*, Jonson in his plays makes twice as many references to London Bridge as does any other Elizabethan dramatist. Jonson mentions it eight times, to four by Shirley and three each by Shakespeare, Middleton, and Beaumont and Fletcher.

The marriage at St. Magnus took place in precisely the year which Gifford¹ conjectured for Jonson's marriage, 1594. The basis for conjecture is the information given by Jonson himself,² that his eldest son Benjamin died of the plague in 1603 at the age of seven, so that he must have been born about 1596. Jonson's *Epigram* xxii., which begins, "Here lyes to each her parents ruth, Mary, the daughter of their youth," mentions that his first daughter died at the age of six months, but does not say whether she was born before or after Benjamin. It has generally been assumed that Mary was the eldest child, and for years Jonson's marriage was assigned to 1592 on the supposition that she was the "Maria Johnson" who died of the plague and was buried at St. Martin in the Fields, November 17, 1593.³ The churchwardens' accounts, however, which likewise record the burial of "Mary Johnson," suggest that she was probably not an infant but an adult, since a fee was paid for her burial in a coffin, as was done for Elbert Johnson in December and for Elbert the younger in October of the same year.⁴ There is no more reason to date Jonson's marriage by means of this entry of burial than by the christening of another Mary

H. J. Fynes-Clinton. My search was made in 1931, and I informed the Rector of the "Johnson" entry in time for mention of it to be made in the Old London Bridge Exhibition of that year (see *The Times*, November 6, 1931, p. 11, where the entry, however, is said to be in the register of St. Michael in Crooked Lane). The entry is given correctly in the useful transcript of marriages at St. Magnus by W. H. Challen, of which typed copies are at the British Museum and the Guildhall.

¹ *The Works of Ben Jonson* (1816), i. xxiii.

² *Epigram* xlv.; *Conversations with Drummond*, section 13.

³ *A Register of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials in the Parish of St. Martin in the Fields*, Harleian Society Registers, xxv. (1898), 139. The entry was confidently connected with Jonson by Peter Cunningham in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i. (1844), 10. Cunningham was more circumspect in suggesting that an Elizabeth Johnson buried at St. Martin's December 8, 1617, "may just possibly" have been Jonson's wife.

⁴ J. V. Kitto, *St. Martin-in-the-Fields, The Accounts of the Churchwardens 1525-1603* (1901), pp. 449, 450 ("Gilbert" on the former page is an error for "Elbert," as in the register).

Johnson at St. Martin's on February 1, 1594/5; and there is no evidence for associating either with Ben Jonson.

The date November 14, 1594, therefore, is a reasonable time for Jonson's marriage. The probability that the entry at St. Magnus refers to Jonson is much increased by the fact that the name Benjamin was still very uncommon in the sixteenth century. I know no record of a Benjamin Johnson in London, other than the poet, earlier than a baptismal entry of 1600. No doubt there may have been others in London, and of course the name can be found elsewhere in England, as in the instance of "Benjaminus Jonson filius Martini," baptized August 12, 1574, at Sutterton, Lincolnshire.¹ In a London record, however, "Beniamine Johnson" can only be the dramatist or someone of whom no other trace has been discovered.

The celebration of Jonson's marriage at St. Magnus would not prove that he was then an inhabitant of the parish. Marriages by banns (as distinguished from marriages by licence) usually took place in the parish of the bride, and it would be enough if Anne Lewis lived in St. Magnus. The parish was an important one, including as it did London Bridge, which Stow describes as "replenished on both the sides with large, fayre and beautifull buildinges, inhabitants for the most part rich marchantes, and other wealthy Cittizens, Mercers and Haberdashers."² Anne Lewis may have been a maid in the house of one of the wealthy citizens. "The fayre Parrish Church of S. Magnus," as Stow calls it, stood in a conspicuous position at the head of the Bridge, commanding the entrance to the City from Southwark. Indeed, persons living in Southwark were frequently married, and occasionally even baptised or buried, at St. Magnus, as the registers prove. The importance of the church had also been increased by a succession of distinguished rectors: Miles Coverdale, translator of the Psalms and former Bishop of Exeter; John Young, Bishop of Rochester, who held the living from 1566 to 1592; and Theophilus Aylmer, Bishop Aylmer's son, the rector at the time of the marriage in question. Spenser had probably visited the parish during his secretaryship to Bishop Young. Since Dr. Theophilus Aylmer was Archdeacon of London, his church became the scene of the annual archdeacon's visitation, when representatives of every parish under his jurisdiction gathered together at St. Magnus.

¹ *Notes & Queries*, 6th S., v. 247 (April 1, 1882).

² *A Survey of London by John Stow*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (1908), i. 211-212.

Jonson was perhaps not the only writer to be married at St. Magnus, though his conviction that "a Poet should detest a Ballet maker" would have made him scorn to be named on the same page as Deloney. I find in the register on February 11, 1592/3, the marriage of "Thomas Delonie and Dorithye Wood." This may or may not refer to the ballad-writer and novelist; if it does, he was not marrying for the first time, since "Richarde, the sonne of Thomas Delony, weauer" was baptized at St. Giles, Cripplegate, in 1586.¹ In the register of St. Michael in Crooked Lane, the parish adjoining St. Magnus, I find that "Samewell Rowley was married to Alice Coley the vijth of Aprill," 1594. If this was the actor-playwright of the Admiral's Men (there was, however, a Samuel Rowley, merchant tailor, buried at Christ Church in 1620),² the record is evidence of a Bankside actor going over London Bridge to marry a wife from the City.

The fact that Jonson seems to have taken a wife in the parish of St. Magnus, which adjoined the theatrical parish of St. Saviour's, Southwark, may indicate that by 1594 he was already an actor, either living on the Bankside or accustomed to the daily crossing of the Bridge on his way to Paris Garden,³ the Rose, or Newington Butts. His marriage suggests also that he now had some confidence in his ability to earn a living. He had justified that confidence by 1597, when, although he was in prison from August to October for his share in *The Isle of Dogs*, in December he began his career as one of Henslowe's authors.

II

The churchwardens' accounts of St. Martin in the Fields for the Michaelmas quarter of 1597 give a list of "Money gathered toward the buylding & for their Pewes y^t weare vnplased." The long list of persons assessed, with the amounts they paid, ranging from sixpence to five shillings, contains the entry: "Beniamyn Johnson xvij^d." ⁴ The building referred to included altering the old loft

¹ Parish register; J. P. Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare* (1846), p. 110; F. O. Mann, *The Works of Thomas Deloney* (1912), p. viii.

² G. E. Bentley, "Records of Players in the Parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate," *P.M.L.A.*, xlv. (1929), 817-818.

³ In *Satiromastix* (1602, sig. G3^v) Horace admits that he has played Zulziman at Paris Garden. When Jonson was one of Pembroke's Men in the summer of 1597, they were acting at the Swan in the liberty of Paris Garden, built by Francis Langley in 1594 or 1595.

⁴ J. V. Kitto, *St. Martin-in-the-Fields, The Accounts of the Churchwardens 1525-1603* (1901), p. 503.

or gallery and erecting a new one, altering pews and making doors to them, making a new strong chest with four keys, and making hooks and ladders "for the better preventing of fyre if any shoold happen."¹ The special collection for building also received contributions from such distinguished parishioners as Burghley, Lord Keeper Egerton, Raleigh, and the Earls of Bedford and Rutland (with all of whom Jonson had relations). Since, according to Thomas Fuller,² Jonson lived as a child in Hartshorn Lane near Charing Cross and first went to school at "a private school in St. Martin's Church,"³ it is likely enough that he was a parishioner of St. Martin's in the last quarter of 1597.

The legend that Jonson was born in Westminster is due, not to Langbaine and Winstanley, as Herford suggested,⁴ but to Fuller and Wood, whom the later writers merely copied. Even though he assigned Jonson's birth to Westminster, Fuller confessed that he had no evidence about the poet's birthplace: "I cannot with all my industrious inquiry *find him* in his *cradle*." Nor can any confidence be placed in Bishop Morley's untrustworthy recollection of Jonson, reported by Isaac Walton: "my lord tells me, he knowes not, but thinks he was borne in westminster."⁵ Wood is responsible for the general currency of the statement.⁶ As a matter of fact, wherever Jonson was born, it was almost certainly not in Westminster. Westminster then comprised only two parishes, St. Margaret's and St. Martin's, and the registers of neither contain any record of Jonson's baptism. His connection with Westminster presumably began when his mother married the bricklayer who lived in Hartshorn Lane.

Fuller, though not infallible, is an honest witness, the earliest to inquire into Jonson's biography; and I see no particular reason to doubt his statement that Jonson, during his time as a bricklayer, "helped in the building of the new structure of *Lincolnes-Inn*." Aubrey speaks of it as a well-known tradition: "His mother, after his father's death, married a Bricklayer, & 'tis generally sayd that he wrought some time with his father in lawe, & particularly on the

¹ Kitto, p. 498; also in John McMaster, *A Short History of the Royal Parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields* (1916), p. 37.

² *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662), p. 243.

³ Cf. McMaster, p. 262.

⁴ C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, i. (1925), 1.

⁵ Herford and Simpson, i. 182.

⁶ *Historia Universitatis Oxoniensis* (1674), p. 273; *Athenae Oxonienses* (1721), i., col. 608.

Garden-wall of Lincoln's Inn next to Chancery lane."¹ Oldys, in the eighteenth century, describes Jonson as working "in the square where the Chapel stands not far from the old Gate which leads into Chancery Lane."² Upon the foregoing evidence Malone made a valuable remark: ³ "If Jonson ever worked with his step-father at his trade in Lincoln's-Inn, it must have been either in 1588, or 1593, in each of which years, as I learn from Dugdale's *Origines Juridicales*, some new buildings were erected by that society." Malone preferred the date 1593, but he was assuming that Jonson was born in 1574 (instead of 1572) and that he went to Cambridge in 1588. The lead given by Malone deserves to be followed up.

The Black Books of Lincoln's Inn, which contain the accounts of the treasurer and of the pensioner for each year ending in November, show that the treasurer paid the following amounts spent by the chief butler for repairs: ⁴

1587	£37	9s.	7d.
1588	£298	7s.	11d.
1589	£27	13s.	4d.
1590	£33	16s.	7d.

These sums were for ordinary repairs, except the £298 spent during the twelvemonth ending in November, 1588, which was paid "pro diuersis reparacionibus et novis Structuris circa dictum Hospicium hoc anno." The society had ordered on May 16, 1588, "that a Brikewall shall be made at the vpper end of the Backside toward Holburne," as well as a gate towards Ficketts Field and another in the brick wall toward the pump. The overseers of the work were James Dalton, Ralph Rokeby, Master of Requests, and William Tymperley.⁵ On May 4, 1589, it was ordered "That the gatehowse shallbe repaired wth all speede,"⁶ but this evidently did not require much work, for the cost of repairs in 1589 and 1590 was no more than usual, as can be seen from the figures above. A few further sums were paid for repairs in 1590, and between 1590 and 1592 Mr. Dalton, as master of the walks, erected a mount or terrace with "a wawle of Brycke."⁷ But the Black Books record no special

¹ Herford and Simpson, i. 178.

² *Ibid.*, i. 5, n.

³ *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* (1821), i. 415-416.

⁴ Black Book V., ff. 420^v, 426, 445^v, 468. Cf. W. P. Baildon, *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, The Black Books*, ii. (1898). Thomas Egerton was treasurer from November, 1587, to November, 1588.

⁵ Black Book V., f. 414^v.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 426.

⁷ Baildon, ii. 17, 27, 28.

activity in building during 1593 or for several years thereafter. The treasurer's accounts do not give the names of the workmen employed. The pensioner, who had smaller repairs done by one bricklayer each year, mentions John Cornish, bricklayer and tiler, in 1587, Thomas Brett "le Bricklayer" in 1588, Edmund Harryson, bricklayer, in 1589, Robert Brett, bricklayer, in 1590 and 1591 (later, between 1600 and 1610, employed to erect new buildings costing twelve hundred and fifty pounds),¹ and John Nelson, tiler, in 1591 and succeeding years.² It is interesting to observe that the accounts for 1567-1568 contain a payment to "William Jonson, Master Brekelayer."³

If Jonson "helped in the building of the new structure of *Lincolnes-Inn*," it was probably during the summer of 1588, the only year possible in which "new structures" were erected at Lincoln's Inn. Since he was born in 1572 he would then have been sixteen. Herford conjectured that he left Westminster School about 1589, but it now seems likely that he ended his formal schooling at least a year earlier, though Camden may well have continued to encourage his studies.

III

Jonson's biographers from Gifford to the present day have been unanimous in believing that he had a son Benjamin, who died on November 20, 1635. This Benjamin is first mentioned by Malone, who discovered the patent of 1621 granting the reversion of the Mastership of the Revels to Benjamin Johnson. At first Malone rightly identified the grantee with the dramatist;⁴ but upon second thoughts, he declared that he was now convinced that the grant was made "either to his son, Benjamin Jonson the younger, who was also a poet . . ., or to some other person of the same name."⁵ To prove the existence of a younger Ben Jonson, who was a poet, he cited the book published in 1672 under the catchpenny title of *The Poems of Ben. Johnson Junior*, despite the fact that the title-page describes this work as "Composed by W. S. Gent."⁶ Malone also mentioned

¹ Baildon, ii. 69, 109, 130.

² Black Book V., ff. 416^v, 431^r, 432, 446^r, 454^v, 465^r, 478, 491^r.

³ Baildon, i. (1897), 445.

⁴ *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* (1790), i., part i., 400, and part ii, 45-46.

⁵ *Ibid.*, i., part ii., 171 (first numbering).

⁶ The author was W[illiam ?] Sambach, a descendant of Sir Thomas Lucy of

an entry in Sir Henry Herbert's office book for 1623, which George Chalmers fortunately quoted with more exactness :¹ " 2 October For the Prince's Companye ; a new Comedy, called, *A Fault in Friendship* : Written by *Young Johnson*, and Broome." " Young Johnson " may or may not have been a son of Ben, but there is no ground whatever for christening him Benjamin.

Malone built his theory principally, however, on a document prepared for Herbert and Thelwell in their suit against Betterton in 1662.² To prove his title to the Mastership of the Revels, Herbert had to show that all previous patentees were dead, and he gave the date of Jonson's death as November 20, 1635. Malone knew that the dramatist died in 1637, and accordingly he supposed that the document proved the existence of another Benjamin Jonson.

As a matter of fact, every single date of death which Herbert set down in the document is wrong. Edmund Tilney is said to have died on August 20, 1610 ; he was, however, buried at Streatham on October 6, 1610.³ Sir George Buc is made to survive until September 20, 1623 ; but he was buried at Broadwater, Sussex, on November 15, 1622.⁴ Sir John Astley's death is dated January 13, 1640 (that is, 1640/41), whereas he died on January 26, 1639/40.⁵ How little Herbert studied accuracy is shown by his dating of the Masters' patents, which he probably had before him ; yet he gave two contradictory dates for Buc's patent and two even for his own. In dating the deaths of his predecessors he seems to have trusted to his memory, recalling fairly well the season of the year, less well the year itself, and filling in the day of the month with the number twenty, which he used three times out of four. All the above dates of death, therefore, which are followed in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and in the principal authorities, have to be corrected.

Malone honestly set before the reader all the facts from which to form an opinion. Gifford replaced the facts by his own assertions.

Charlecote, and he writes dedicatory verses to the Earl of Rutland and his son, to his own kinsman Lord Aston, and " To all the ancient Family of the *Lucyes*, and to all their Honourable Extractions." He gives away his identity by adding to the poems an advertisement for a " New-found Medicine " and " pleasant cordialities " to be had by inquiring at a certain shop for " *Capt. Sambach*." See *Notes & Queries*, 5th S., ii. 208, and 6th S., vi. 475.

¹ *A Supplemental Apology for the Believers in the Shakspeare-Papers* (1799), p. 215.

² J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert* (1917), p. 109.

³ *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, iii. (1836), 311.

⁴ Parish register.

⁵ J. M. Russell, *The History of Maidstone* (1881), p. 347 ; J. Cave-Browne, *History of All Saints, Maidstone* (1889), p. 153.

Without any warning that he was indulging in conjecture, he combined Malone's first theory that the reversion was granted to the poet with his second theory that the grantee was a younger Ben, who died in 1635. Gifford declared "that, finding himself incapable, during his last illness, of performing the duties of the office, supposing it to devolve upon him, he had been graciously permitted by Charles to transfer the patent to his son, who died in 1635."¹ These categorical statements seem to have been Gifford's own invention. In the *Dictionary of National Biography* Herford made Jonson obtain the reversion (not for himself in 1621, but) for his son Benjamin "in 1635," a misreading even of Gifford's account. Nevertheless, the authority of the *D.N.B.* has perpetuated the legend in that form even in Dr. Greg's *English Literary Autographs*, i. (1925), no. xxiii.

In the Oxford edition, where Jonson's Revels patent of 1621 is printed in full,² Herford says nothing of any transfer of the reversion, but young Benjamin, strange to say, remains. "Of a second son," Herford writes, "we know only that he died two years before his father, in 1635."³ Thus the unlucky Benjamin is left tenaciously clinging to his date, like Baron Munchausen's horse tethered to the steeple, when all that once supported him has melted quite away. For the person said to have died in 1635 was the holder of the Revels reversion, who on Herford's own showing was Jonson himself. Since the date is an obvious error, the only fragment of evidence for the existence of a son who died in 1635 completely vanishes.

Besides the Mary and Benjamin on whose early deaths he wrote poems, Jonson probably had several other children not mentioned in the Oxford edition, but briefly listed by Cunningham and by Castelain.⁴ Collier⁵ found most of them in unpublished parish registers, where I have verified his quotations. He was wholly wrong in only one instance, when he assigned to the poet a "Benjamin Johnson, infant," buried October 1, 1600, at St. Botolph, Bishopsgate; for this child had been christened on September 3, 1600, as the son of Robert Johnson.⁶ The register of St. Giles, Cripplegate,

¹ *The Works of Ben Jonson* (1816), i., cxliv.

² *Ben Jonson*, i. (1925), 237-239.

³ *Ibid.*, i. 9.

⁴ Francis Cunningham, *The Works of Ben Jonson* (1875), i. 159; Maurice Castelain, *Ben Jonson* (1907), p. 16.

⁵ *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare* (1846), pp. xxii., xxiii.

⁶ A. W. C. Hallen, *The Registers of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, London* (1889), i. 147, 326.

records the christening on November 10, 1594, of "Elizabeth, daughter of Johnson, bricklayer," no first name for the father being given. Collier copied the entry,¹ but did not publish it. This christening, only four days before the marriage at St. Magnus, no doubt refers to the child of some other bricklayer of the extremely common name of Johnson.

Another entry at St. Giles, Cripplegate, which Collier published,² is of the christening on December 9, 1599, of "Joseph, the sonne of Beniamyne Johnson." There is no reason why Joseph should not have been a son of the dramatist. Cripplegate would have been a convenient residence while Jonson was writing for the Chamberlain's Men at the Curtain in Shoreditch, the next parish to Cripplegate. In August and September, 1599, Jonson was collaborating with Dekker in *Page of Plymouth* and *The Tragedy of Robert II, King of Scots*,³ and Dekker apparently had daughters christened at St. Giles, Cripplegate, in 1594, 1598, and 1602.⁴

"Benamin Johnson sonne to Benamin" was christened on February 20, 1607/8, at St. Anne, Blackfriars. Collier called attention to the baptism of this son and to his burial at St. Anne's on November 18, 1611, as "Benjamin Johnson sonne to Benjamin." He may be reasonably accepted as a child of Jonson, who dates his epistle before *Volpone* "From my house in the Black-Friars this 11. of February. 1607." The register of St. Anne's contains another Benjamin who may be mentioned in passing, "Beniamin Jonsone sone of Roger," baptized July 10, 1602. Roger Johnson was probably one of the Blackfriars Puritans, to judge from the names he gave his sons, including Nathaniel in 1600 and Samuel in 1604/5. In 1620 Roger Johnson, citizen and joiner, and his wife Suzan, leased out a tavern and another house which he had built north of Blackfriars churchyard, between "the Ankeris house" on the west and the tennis court of Gedion Losier on the east.⁵

An entry not previously known has been found by my friend Mr. Bernard M. Wagner in the register of St. Mary Matfellow, Whitechapel. This records the christening on March 25, 1610, of "Elisib. daughter of Ben Johnson." The familiar form "Ben"

¹ Bodleian MS. Eng. hist. e. 1, f. 106.

² Collier, however, mistook the baptismal entry for a record of burial, just as he did with Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Dekker, baptized at St. Giles in 1598.

³ W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, ii. (1908), 205.

⁴ F. P. Wilson, "Three Notes on Thomas Dekker," *M.L.R.* xv. (1920), 82-85.

⁵ Hastings Roll 297 (Guildhall), nos. 29, 30.

points to Jonson as the girl's father. He need not, of course, have been living in Whitechapel, nor need the child have been by his wife. There was also a "Beniamen Johnson fil. Ben.," christened at St. Martin in the Fields on April 6, 1610.¹ Elizabeth and Benjamin must evidently have had different mothers; they may or may not have had the same father. Since Benjamin of Blackfriars was still living in 1610, it does not at first seem likely that another son of Jonson should be named Benjamin. Still, the men of his time did often give the same name to two sons, in the hope that one at least would survive. The stories Jonson told Drummond make it clear that he is likely to have had a number of children, by no means all legitimate.

Jonson's own account of his marriage was that "he married a wyfe who was a shrew yet honest, 5 yeers he had not bedded wth her but remained wth my Lord Aulbanie."² None of Jonson's biographers has satisfactorily dated this residence with Aubigny. "From his home he remained absent for five years," writes Herford,³ "but in 1602-3 he exchanged the hospitality of Sir Robert Townshend for that of Esmé Stewart, Lord of Aubigny." The date is hardly possible, since in February, 1602/3, Jonson was living "upon" Townshend, and Aubigny, coming to England on account of the accession of his cousin King James, is not likely to have taken a house in London before the plague subsided at the end of the year. "When the King came in England, at that tyme the Pest was in London," moreover, Jonson was at Sir Robert Cotton's house in Huntingdonshire.⁴ Herford and Simpson write in a note: "The 'five years' are fixed with much accuracy by Manningham's date February, 1602 (B.M. Harl. MS. 5353, p. 130), when Jonson 'lived upon' Townshend, and February 7, 1607, when he dated his dedication to *Volpone* 'from my house in the Blackfriars'." Here they are writing without much accuracy, for Manningham's date is not 1602 by our reckoning, but February 12, 1602/3; the reference to the Harleian MS. is not p. 130, but f. 98^v (p. 130 is the reference in the printed *Diary of John Manningham*, Camden Society, 1868); and the date of Jonson's dedication of *Volpone* is not February 7,

¹ *A Register . . . of St. Martin in the Fields*, Harleian Society Registers, xxv. (1898), 40; first claimed for Jonson by Peter Cunningham. Cf. R. B. McKerrow in *R.E.S.*, ii. (1926), 229.

² *Conversations with Drummond*, section 13.

³ Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, i. 31.

⁴ *Conversations with Drummond*, section 13.

but February 11. Herford and Simpson interpreted "1607" as 1607/8,¹ but Dr. Greg has since pointed out that Jonson at this time generally used the calendar reckoning, beginning the year January 1, and that the date "1607" on the Volpone quarto is probably also a calendar date.² It is a fair conclusion that Jonson had a house of his own in the Blackfriars by February, 1606/7. The "five years" from 1602 to 1607 are now narrowed down to a little over three years, from the end of 1603 to the beginning of 1607.

Drummond records one other allusion by Jonson to Aubigny:³

to me he read the Preface of his arte of Poesie, upon Horace Arte of poesie, wher he heth ane apologie of a Play of his St Bartholomees faire, by Criticus is understood Done. ther is ane Epigrame of Sir Edward Herberts befor it, the he said he had done in my Lord Aubanies House 10 yeers since anno 1604.

The transcriber of Drummond's notes, Sir Robert Sibbald, may either have omitted a word at the end of the line after "ane Epigrame of Sir Edward Herberts befor it, the," or he may have misread the last word. The Oxford editors suppose that Sibbald omitted the word "translation," but that is surely far too long a word to be easily passed over. David Laing⁴ explained "the" as an error for "this," but perhaps it is more likely to be an error for "that," a reading suggested to me by Dr. McKerrow. Exactly the same error seems to have occurred at line 364 of the *Conversations*,⁵ where "the Earl said the Woemen were mens shadowes" should probably read, "the Earl said that Woemen were mens shadowes" (as in the title of Jonson's song in *The Forest*, no. vii, "That Women are but Mens shaddowes"). The last sentence of the Aubigny paragraph will then read, "ther is ane Epigrame of Sir Edward Herberts befor it, that he said he had done in my Lord Aubanies House 10 yeers since anno 1604." The "he" in "he had done" is ambiguous, but I think it is less likely to refer to Jonson than to Herbert. Dr. McKerrow agrees, and remarks, "The more natural meaning seems to be that Sir Edward Herbert had written the epigram in Aubigny's house." It is immaterial to the point at issue whether "10 yeers since anno 1604" is explained as a mistake by Drummond or

¹ *Ben Jonson*, ii. 49.

² "The Riddle of Jonson's Chronology," *The Library*, March, 1926, pp. 340-347.

³ *Conversations with Drummond*, section 5; Herford and Simpson, i. 134, 156.

⁴ *Notes on Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*, Shakespeare Society (1842), p. 6.

⁵ Herford and Simpson, i. 142, 167.

Sibbald,¹ or as ten years before the date of *Bartholomew Fair* (1614).² The essential point is that the paragraph quoted does not really prove that Jonson was a resident in Aubigny's house in the year 1604. No doubt Aubigny was already one among Jonson's patrons, as he was at the time of the *Eastward Ho* affair in 1605;³ but Jonson's dedication of *Sejanus* to Aubigny dates, not from 1605, but only from 1616.

The records of the Consistory Court of London discovered in 1921⁴ furnish good evidence that Jonson and his wife were living together in January, 1605/6. Had Jonson been living at this time with Aubigny, he would have been cited alone, not with his wife. The presentment was made by the churchwardens and "sworn men" of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, who must be credited with knowing something of their neighbours' affairs. Jonson and his wife, of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, are charged with having absented themselves from the communion ever since the King came in (March 24, 1602/3). Jonson replied, on April 26, 1606, that "bothe he and his wife doe goe ordinaryly to Church and to his owne parishe Church & so hath don this halfe yeare." Jonson refused to receive the communion, "but his wife he sayethe for any thing he knowthe hath gon to Church & vsed alwayes to receyve the Communion and is appoynted to receyve the Communion to morow." Jonson would scarcely have spoken with such definiteness had he been living apart from his wife since 1603. Even had they been reunited only since the past half-year, there is no room for "five years" between 1603 and 1605.

If Jonson lived for as long as five years with Aubigny, it must have been, not at the beginning of James I's reign, but in the years immediately preceding his journey to Scotland. From the spring of 1613, when he returned from Paris, to the summer of 1618, when he set out for Edinburgh, nothing is known of Jonson's place of residence, except that he was still living in the Blackfriars in 1617.⁵ Aubigny's mansion was in the Blackfriars, where the register of St. Anne's mentions "Katherine seruauante to y^e L: Obony" (*sic*), buried October 2, 1611, and "Katheren Obeny daughter to the

¹ That "1604" is an error for "1609" is conjectured by G. C. Moore Smith, *The Poems English and Latin of Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury* (1923), p. xxxi; cf. p. 148.

² F. Cunningham, *The Works of Ben Jonson* (1875), ix. 371-372.

³ Herford and Simpson, i. 198.

⁴ *Ibid.*, i. 220-223.

⁵ *Ibid.*, i. 232, 233.

Lord Ob:", christened on August 20, 1613. The Countess of Somerset was allowed to remove to Aubigny's house in the Blackfriars (evidently in his absence) on October 27, 1615, while under suspicion of procuring Overbury's murder.¹ Jonson, on returning to his home in the Blackfriars after an absence of at least six months abroad in 1612 and 1613, may have found, after a brief renewal of domestic life, that he preferred the freedom to which he had become accustomed in Paris.

According to Gifford, when Jonson visited Drummond his wife was dead; but Gifford had no evidence for this statement beyond Drummond's use of the past tense, "he married a wyfe who was a shrew yet honest." Drummond, of course, was writing indirect discourse, as in the preceding sentence, "He was Master of Arts in both ye Universities by y^r favour not his studie." In exactly the same way, the sentence here in question, "5 years he had not bedded w^t her but remained w^t my Lord Aulbanie," has always seemed to me most naturally understood as indirect discourse representing the direct statement by Jonson: "Five years I have not bedded with her, but remained with my Lord Aubigny." In that case, Jonson's wife did not die before 1618, but after 1618.

Collier cited from the register of St. Giles, Cripplegate, a record of the marriage on July 27, 1623, of "Beniamyne Johnson and Hester Hopkins."² Writers who ignore this entry or dismiss it without consideration ought to suggest some other Benjamin Johnson to whom it can refer. The only one who has been named is the "Ben Jonson, junior," who now returns to the thin air from which he came.³ Jonson's first son, and Benjamin of the Blackfriars, were dead long before 1623; Benjamin of St. Martin's was only thirteen; Roger Johnson's son Benjamin was old enough to marry, but there is nothing to connect him with Cripplegate. If Jonson married a

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I., 1611-1618*, pp. 322-323.

² Bodleian MS. Eng. hist. e. 1, f. 63^r; *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare*, p. xxiv. According to a document first printed in 1869 (see Herford and Simpson, i. 235), "M^r Ben Johnson the Poet" was living, in January, 1619/20, "by Cripellgatt." The document, which has some absurd misspellings, furnishes excellent support for Collier's interpretation of the Cripplegate marriage as Jonson's—so excellent, in fact, that I should like to examine the original before accepting it as genuine, though Herford and Simpson do so without any question. If it can be traced and proved genuine, all the better.

³ Fleay was of opinion that the person married was an illegitimate son of Jonson, born about 1602; but he had no evidence for this or for other confident statements about Jonson's children (*A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama* [1891], i. 346).

second wife, one would expect him to have left some mention of her ; but his conversations with Drummond, the source of most of what we know about Jonson's life, were already past, and it happened that he made no will. The argument from silence is always unsafe, and in the seventeenth century the private affairs of poets often remained private. A second marriage by Jonson seems unlikely, but it is not impossible.

Fuller, writing soon after Jonson's death, remarked of Jonson : " He was not very happy in his children, and most happy in those which died first, though none lived to survive him."¹ His first son (" Ben Jonson his best piece of poetry "), " Mary, the daughter of [her parents'] youth," and Benjamin of the Blackfriars all died young. Fuller's language makes it clear that Jonson had other children than those who died in infancy. Among them may have been " Joseph, the sone of Beniamyne Johnson," baptized at Cripple-gate in 1599 (conceivably the " Young Johnson " who collaborated with Brome in 1623, but there is no evidence), and the Elizabeth and Benjamin christened in 1610. And in all likelihood Jonson had more children, still to be discovered, between the Benjamin of 1596 and the Benjamin of 1607/8.

¹ *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662), p. 243.

TOWARDS A BIOGRAPHY OF EDWARD BENLOWES

BY HAROLD JENKINS

IN the January number of *The Review of English Studies*¹ appeared an article by Mr. Carl Niemeyer, giving new light on Edward Benlowes. Having recently been engaged on some independent research on the life and career of this poet, I am able to add several important details to the biographical information which Mr. Niemeyer has collected.

Mr. Niemeyer rightly attaches importance to the figure of Sergeant William Benlowes (or Bendlowes), one of the most eminent lawyers of his day and the most distinguished of the poet's forbears. It was he who accumulated most of the family's estates in Essex, and he was long remembered for his charitable benefactions. These, though mostly made during his lifetime, are referred to in his last will and testament, a most formidable document bearing the date November 17, 1584,² two days before his death. According to the provision of his will, the Sergeant was buried by the side of his wife Alienor (or Eleanor) in the chancel of Great Bardfield church, and on their tombs were set their portraits and the Benlowes coat-of-arms, engraved in brass.³

An inventory of the lands of Sergeant William Benlowes may be found in the Inquisition Post Mortem.⁴ They consisted principally of the manors of Brent Hall, Justices, and half of Cockfields in Finchingfield; the manor of Priors in Great Bardfield; and that of Fennes in Bocking. With Justices went also Hawksells (or Hawkes-hall) in Toppesfield.⁵ The Benlowes estates also included smaller

¹ Pp. 31-41.

² Not July 4, 1571, as Mr. Niemeyer states. Somerset House, 10 Brudenell.

³ The brass of Alienor, but not that of the Sergeant, still survives. There is also, in the sanctuary of the church, a long Latin inscription celebrating the Sergeant's generosity and distinction in the law. It is quoted in full in Muilman's *History of Essex* (ii. 295 ff.).

⁴ Chancery Series II, vol. 207, no. 59.

⁵ Contemporary documents usually look upon Justices and Hawksells as alternative names for the same estate.

properties in Finchingfield, Great Bardfield, Little Bardfield, Bardfield Saling, Thaxted, Great Sampford, Little Sampford, Bocking, and Hatfield Peverel.

Mr. Niemeyer traces the descent of Edward Benlowes from William the Sergeant, who was his great-grandfather, through his grandfather William and his father Andrew, who married Phillip, or Philippa, Gage.¹ She was the daughter of Edward Gage, of Bentley in the parish of Framfield (Sussex), and at the time of her marriage was about twenty-five years old.² The marriage of Andrew and Philippa took place in 1601. Philippa brought with her a dowry of £1,500, and a marriage settlement was made securing the inheritance of the Benlowes estates to the heirs of Andrew and Philippa. Philippa's father, Edward Gage, and Henry Smith of Shalford (Essex) were appointed trustees.³

The Benlowes family-tree, as recorded by the Heralds' Visitation of Essex in 1634,⁴ names only three children of Andrew and Philippa, and Mr. Niemeyer has not traced others. But there were six children of the marriage—five sons, Edward, William, Henry, Andrew, and Philip,⁵ and a daughter, Clare. According to the Inquisition Post Mortem,⁶ Andrew Benlowes died on April 12, 1612, leaving Edward the heir to the family estates. He succeeded on the death of his grandfather William on November 18, 1613. His age then was 11 years, 4 months, and 6 days; and he was therefore born on July 12, 1602. This is a year earlier than has usually been believed on the authority of Wood, whose statements of the poet's age are avowedly approximate. Benlowes was therefore nearly eighteen when he matriculated at Cambridge, and lived to complete his seventy-fourth year.⁷

Being inherited by a minor, the estates came under the control of the Crown until Edward should be of age. The wardship was granted to William Smith, of Cressing Temple, Benlowes' great-uncle,⁸ on November 17, 1614; he bought it for £266 13s. 4d.,

¹ This, and not Cage, is undoubtedly the correct form of the surname.

² She was thirty-eight and more at the death of her father on March 11, 1614. (*Inquisition Post Mortem, Sussex Record Society Publications*, xiv. 98.)

³ *Inquisition Post Mortem, Chancery Series II*, vol. 343, no. 137. The entailing of the estates was effected by means of a recovery in the Easter term of 1601. (*Common Pleas* 43/73.)

⁴ *The Visitations of Essex*, ed. Metcalfe, Harleian Soc., i. 347.

⁵ *Chancery Proceedings*, Collins 140/147.

⁶ *Chancery Series II*, vol. 343, no. 137. Also *Wards*, vol. 53, no. 229.

⁷ Wood gives his age at matriculation as "about 16 years," and says that he died "an. 1676, aged 73 years or more." (*Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 358-9.)

⁸ Benlowes' grandfather William had married Clare, William Smith's sister.

as appears from an entry in the books of the Court of Wards and Liveries,¹ as well as from a note added to the feodary's survey of the estate.² A later feodary's survey was made on November 18, 1623, no doubt in preparation for the delivery of the property to the ward himself, though of this transaction I have traced no record.³

I am unable to add any information of Benlowes' life at Cambridge, but it is clear that he had pleasant memories of St. John's, to which he acknowledges his indebtedness by his subsequent benefactions. College benefactions seem to have been almost a family tradition; Sergeant Benlowes had been a benefactor of Corpus Christi, and Edward's father had made gifts to the library of his own college, King's.⁴ Edward, with his customary lavish generosity, gave to the library of St. John's fifty pounds' worth of books, as well as globes and other ornaments.⁵ Among these were some *pietre commesse*, or inlaid marbles (characteristic of Benlowes' love of unusual ornaments and unusual forms of art), which were greatly admired by Evelyn when he visited St. John's College on August 31, 1654. Benlowes' gifts were renowned among his contemporaries, and his name is inscribed as one of the benefactors of the college in the *Liber Memorialis* in the college library.⁶

There is no record of Benlowes having graduated at Cambridge; but many of the sons of country gentlemen resided for a year or two at the university without proceeding to a degree. On leaving the university, or sometimes while still in residence, they would enter one of the Inns of Court; for some training in the law was looked on by the aristocracy as a necessary supplement to a university education. Benlowes accordingly was admitted to Lincoln's Inn on January 30, 1621/2,⁷ following the precedent of his father and grandfather as well as of his great-grandfather, the Sergeant,⁸ who had been one of the governors of the Inn.

About 1630 the poet completed his education by making the fashionable grand tour, which he undertook, as he says, for his better

¹ Wards 9/162.

² Wards 5/13. No. 2066. This survey rates the lands at £25 6s. 8d. per ann., an amount which corresponds with the valuation in the Inquisition Post Mortem.

³ And that in spite of the generous assistance of Mr. J. Hirschfield, who is making a study of the Court of Wards and Liveries, and who helped me to find the feodary's survey.

⁴ Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, i. 132.

⁵ Wright and Jones, *Memorials of Cambridge*, ed. Cooper, ii. 97.

⁶ See Baker, *History of St. John's College, Cambridge*, i. 340.

⁷ *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn*, i. 189.

⁸ *Ibid.*, i. 47, 68, 123.

improvement and knowledge of tongues and affairs of the world.¹ Mr. Niemeyer quotes Fuller to the effect that Benlowes visited abroad seven courts of princes. He does not, however, notice that Benlowes himself makes more than one reference to his travels. In the poem "To My Fancy," prefixed to *Theophila*, he speaks of having viewed six of Europe's courts,² while the Latin "Peroratio Eucharistica" lists the countries in which he has travelled—France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Italy—and the subjoined Latin poem tells how he has seen the rivers Scheldt, Rhine, and Danube.³ Since he speaks here, also, of having known too well the arrogance of Spaniards, he may also have visited Spain. He attended lectures at the universities of Padua, Louvain, and Leyden, as appears from a passage in his poem "On Oxford, the Muse's Paradise," included in the volume *Oxonii Encomium*:

We have faire Padua, Lovain, Leyden seen;
At Theirs, as, OXFORD, at Your LECTURES, been.

Near the beginning of his travels Benlowes spent some time in Brussels, where he sent home his English servant and replaced him with a Dutchman named John Schoren, who commended himself to him by his knowledge of languages. Schoren travelled with him on the Continent for two years. At the end of that time they found themselves in Venice, and here Benlowes became dangerously ill with small-pox. Upon his recovery he returned to England, taking Schoren with him,⁴ and he then for some years led the life of a country gentleman at his Essex house, Brent Hall.⁵

Anthony à Wood, knowing that Benlowes in his earlier years had been a Catholic, imagined that he had picked up the taint of Romanism while on the Continent.⁶ What actually happened was quite the reverse. His upbringing had been Catholic, and while he may have imbibed some Protestant doctrines at Cambridge, his conversion to Protestantism seems to have taken place shortly after his return from abroad. Schoren at any rate says that Benlowes was a Catholic during his travels.⁷ Yet in 1632, when he certainly had not been long back home, he prefixed verses to Ralph Winterton's

¹ Chancery Proceedings, Collins, 28/11.

² Saintsbury, *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, i. 323.

³ *Ibid.*, i. 472. The rivers are again named in *Oxonii Encomium*, where Benlowes adds also the Neckar and the Brenta.

⁴ Chancery Proceedings, Reynardson 31/14 (answer); Collins 28/11.

⁵ See below, pp. 281 ff.

⁶ *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 358.

⁷ Chancery Proceedings, Reynardson 31/14 (answer).

translation of the aphorisms of Johann Gerhard, an eminent Lutheran often distinguished by his bitter attacks on Papists. And in the same year Winterton dedicated to Benlowes his translation of *The Considerations of Drexelius upon Eternity* (published 1636), applauding his conversion to the English church, the only one among all his kindred to be a zealous Protestant. The passage is quoted by Mr. Niemeyer, who is, nevertheless, somewhat tentative in his suggestion that the Benlowes family were Catholics. All the evidence, however, shows quite clearly that they were.

Sergeant William Benlowes had been an ardent Catholic. In 1556 he was a member of a commission formed to suppress Lollards and heretics in Essex and in 1557 he founded a chantry at Great Bardfield, providing for a priest to say mass for the souls of Queen Mary and Philip, and of his father and mother, his wife and himself. A letter written by John Fortho to the Earl of Salisbury on April 11, 1611, preserved among the State Papers, describes the death of "Andrew Bendlowes the younger, of Burnthalle in Essex," who was "a learned Papist."¹ This Andrew was probably not Edward's father,² but he must have been a close connection. Either he or the poet's father was presumably the "Andrew Bendlosse al[ia]s Bendishe" of Essex listed in a docquet of November 23, 1607, among nineteen persons the benefit of whose recusancy was granted to Sir Richard Coningsby³; and one of them may also have been the Andrew Benlowes who is named among eight recusants "stayed" for the Earl of Southampton *circa* 1600.⁴ The second of these lists of recusants also includes the name of Edward Gage of Bentley, Edward Benlowes' maternal grandfather. Edward's mother was still a Catholic in 1643, as appears from the letter to Sir Thomas Barrington quoted by Mr. Niemeyer.⁵ Elizabeth Benlowes, the wife of Edward's brother William, was also a Catholic and suffered sequestration under the Commonwealth⁶; while her daughter Philippa, Edward's niece, married Walter Blount of Mapledurham, a member of a noted Catholic family. A Mary Benlowes, widow,

¹ State Papers, Domestic, Jas. I, vol. 63, no. 26.

² Who, according to the Inquisition Post Mortem cited above, did not die until April 12, 1612, and who was then certainly older than the "nighe 30 yeare" of Fortho's letter. Moreover, Fortho himself distinguishes the Andrew Benlowes who died in 1611 as the younger, which suggests that there were two of the name.

³ State Papers, Docquets, vol. 8.

⁴ State Papers, Domestic, Eliz., vol. 276, no. 109.

⁵ Benlowes there insists that his mother has not been proved a papist; but only one inference can be drawn from his failure to deny the charge.

⁶ Chancery Proceedings, Collins 140/147 (answer).

of Little Bardfield, whose income of £44 8s. 8d. was derived from rents paid her by Edward Benlowes himself,¹ was also under sequestration for Popish recusancy from 1643 on²; and in 1651 Edward Benlowes' cousin, Mrs. Clare James, the widow of a papist of Smarden in Kent, was denounced by one John Mungeham for Romanism.³ This Clare was the daughter of Francis Benlowes, the brother of Edward's father.⁴ It appears from Mungeham's statement that Francis and his family lived for a time with Edward at Brent Hall, and all of them were Catholics. Mungeham had it on the authority of the Brent Hall servants that Clare and her sister were in the habit of wearing crucifixes, while Clare's brother was a self-confessed papist and her parents were said not to have attended church once in twenty years.

Edward, then, seems to have been the only member of the family who was not a Catholic. When in 1643 he protests to Sir Thomas Barrington against attempts to withhold his rents on account of his mother's recusancy, there is no suspicion of popery against himself. Had he, of course, openly supported the king against the Parliament, he might, as a delinquent, have had his estates sequestrated nevertheless. But there is no record of any sequestration of his property during the early years of the Civil War. He continued to live at Brent Hall unmolested, though not without fear, for, even though he conformed to the Parliamentary ordinances, his sympathies were all on the king's side, and the Parliamentary forces were very strong in Essex. Benlowes' old servant Schoren had left his employ some years previously, after defrauding him of money, and round about 1646 came to him in poverty, seeking to re-enter his service. It was partly to have the added protection of Schoren's presence in the house against the danger which he feared from the supporters of the Parliament that Benlowes was persuaded to re-engage him; and subsequently he was in such fear that his property would be plundered that he entrusted a sum of £30 to Schoren's keeping.⁵

Since Benlowes had been captain of a troop of Essex horse,⁶ it is somewhat surprising that he contrived for some years to hold aloof from the civil strife. Essex was not, however, the scene of

¹ State Papers, Interregnum, vol. 252, no. 136, I.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 261, p. 29.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. 158, no. 315.

⁴ Chancery Proceedings, Chas. I, 1st series, J33/106.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Collins 28/11.

⁶ Cf. below, p. 281.

much fighting before 1648, and, so long as he contributed to the heavy taxation imposed by the Parliament, it seems to have been possible for a man like Benlowes to exist in comparative quiet. Later on, however, Benlowes had a commission and his servant Schoren was also engaged in the war as a common soldier.¹ It appears that Benlowes took part in the Royalist rising which occurred in June, 1648, when Sir Charles Lucas, a well-known officer, persuaded many of the Essex train-bands to join in revolt. The king's party established themselves in Colchester, but after a siege were forced to capitulate on August 27. On May 7, 1649, the standing committee for Essex, whose duty it was to deal with delinquents, was authorized to proceed against those who had taken part in the revolt²; and on July 5, 1649, this committee forwarded to the Parliamentary committee sitting at Goldsmiths' Hall a list of Essex delinquents, with the fines necessary for them to compound for their delinquency.³ In the list is the name of Edward Benlowes, whose real estate is valued at £322 per annum. The composition, computed at one-tenth of the gross value of the estate, is put at £600. Benlowes himself, when selling his estates to Nathan Wright in 1657, estimated their annual value at £1,000 and upwards; so there is perhaps reason to doubt whether this £600 represents the full amount of his fine.

Anthony à Wood has led posterity to believe that Benlowes' descent from affluence to poverty was due to his reckless generosity and his lavish patronage of the arts. Mr. Niemeyer, no doubt, is right in supposing the extortions of the Parliament during and after the Civil War to have been a contributory cause. It is about this time that we first find signs that Benlowes may have been in financial difficulties. In 1645, for the sum of £300, he mortgaged to Matthew Reeve, his own tenant, a farm called Pitfield Barnes in the parish of Hatfield Peverel.⁴ Yet on January 12, 1649/50, he could pay £250 to buy copyhold property at Claines in Worcestershire.⁵ This property consisted of four dwelling-houses with land adjoining them; they were held from one Walter Thomas, who had recently acquired the manor of Claines and Whiston, which had come into the market with the forfeiture of the estates of the Royalist bishop of Worcester.

¹ Chancery Proceedings, Reynardson 31/14 (answer).

² State Papers, Interregnum, vol. 248, no. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, no. 31.

⁴ Close Rolls, 21 Chas. I, Part I, 31.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1649, Part X, 18.

Just when Benlowes' fortunes seem to have been at their turning-point, they suffered a major calamity in the burning down of Brent Hall, Benlowes' country seat. This disaster occurred one night in 1653. Benlowes was left without a residence fitting for one of his station and had to seek a lodging in London. Some items of property were saved from the fire and Benlowes commissioned Schoren to go into Essex and arrange for their sale. They included household goods, corn, cattle, and a brass blunderbuss of some value. Schoren, however, behaved with flagrant dishonesty, and Benlowes never received the proceeds of the sale.¹ All this must have meant a further serious inroad upon Benlowes' finances, for insurance against fire came in only after the Fire of London.

By 1654 Benlowes had contracted debts amounting to £3,000; yet, characteristically enough, on the marriage of his niece Philippa in that year to Walter Blount of Mapledurham, he gave her the handsome marriage portion of £6,000.² For this it was necessary for him to mortgage his estates in Essex. He did this willingly enough; for, as he explains, "haueing euer liued vnmarried and intending soe to dye," and his brothers all being dead, he had no prospect of any male heir, and the estates were bound on his own death to pass from the Benlowes name. Accordingly, with his estates as security, he borrowed £9,000 from Robert Abdy and William Meggs. A fine was levied in the Hilary term of 1654/5,³ and the mortgage agreement was embodied in an indenture dated February 2nd.⁴ Subsequently the mortgage was paid off when the estates were sold to Nathan Wright in 1657.

This was a complicated transaction: the estates were seriously encumbered, and there was considerable dispute about the purchase price and about various items of compensation. A number of suits in Chancery followed, by means of which the different embroilments in which Benlowes found himself can be traced in some detail. Benlowes also had a lengthy Chancery dispute with his servant Schoren, arising out of an annuity that he had formerly granted him. Between 1657 and 1666 he was involved in continual litigation, and I hope in a later article to describe these Chancery suits in full.

¹ Chancery Proceedings, Collins 28/11.

² Chancery Proceedings, Bridges 444/123. Wood gives the amount of Philippa's marriage portion variously as £3,000 and £7,000, but he is wrong each time. (*The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. Clark, ii. 361, 362.)

³ Close Rolls, 1654, Part IX, 16.

⁴ Common Pleas 25(2)/550A.

It is not in any way surprising that Benlowes' literary productiveness fails during these troubled years.¹ It was in the peaceful penury of his last years in Oxford that he returned to the solace of poetry. But the poetry of his Oxford years is comparatively insignificant. The period of his principal activity is the twenty years following his return from abroad, culminating in the publication of *Theophila* in 1652. This was the time of his prosperity; while it lasted he was both a man of affairs and a patron and amateur of the arts.

He may have been something of a public figure. He was at one time captain of a troop of Essex horse,² an appointment which was looked on as fitting for the best knights and gentlemen of the county. A captain had to be a man of note and means, and a command of horse carried greater prestige than one of foot. As evidence of Benlowes' captaincy Mr. Niemeyer cites the endorsement of the 1643 letter to Barrington and quotes also Samuel Butler's gibe and Benlowes' own signature to his poem *De celeberrima & florentissima Trinobantiados Augustæ Civitate*.³ Benlowes is also addressed as a captain of Essex horse (*militum equestrium in Essexia Capitaneus*) at the head of some verses prefixed to his *Sphinx Theologica*, where he is extolled for his combination of military and poetic achievement.

Besides his captaincy of a troop of horse, Benlowes had undoubtedly much to occupy him in his private affairs. Occasional references show him acting as a man of property and the head of the Benlowes family. He made a grant of £40 from his estate to his brother Henry while he lived, and in order to keep the estates in the Benlowes name and family, since he himself had resolved thus early never to marry, he made a settlement upon the eldest of his brothers, William.⁴ William died in 1633,⁵ and Edward

¹ He published two poems in 1657; *The Summary of Wisdom* and *A Glance at the Glories of Sacred Friendship*. From then until 1672 his only known composition is *Threnothriambeuticon* (1660), a series of Latin verses on the restoration of Charles II.

² *Essex Review*, xviii. 14.

³ The full signature is: "Edwardus Benlowes Armiger, Turmæ Equestris in Comitatu Essexiæ Præfectus." In this citation Mr. Niemeyer seems to have been misled by Wood. *De celeberrima & florentissima Trinobantiados Augustæ Civitate* is the title of the "mantissa" by Benlowes, not of the poem to which it is appended. That is a *Panegyricon inaugurale* . . . *Richardî Fenn*, and it was written not by Fenn but by John Sictor in celebration of Fenn's mayoralty.

⁴ Chancery Proceedings, Collins 140/147 (answer).

⁵ See his will at Somerset House, 111 Russell.

then provided for his brother's widow according to the jointure he had granted her, allowing her £66 13s. 4d., payable out of the rectory of Great Bardfield.¹ On February 7, 1634/5, he sold to his brother Henry for £500 the wood called Oldfrith (or Holdfrith) Wood in the parishes of Great Bardfield and Thaxted.² In 1646 Benlowes was one of four trustees appointed by an agreement which gave to William Nevill of Cressing Temple (who was Benlowes' second cousin) £50 per annum and half of the remaining profits for 60 years out of the tithes and certain fenlands in Surfleet (Lincolnshire) belonging to Christopher Roper.³ In 1649, when Thomas Peirce, the son of Benlowes' sister Clare, inherited his father's estate, he granted to his younger brothers and sisters certain lands in Alveston (Warwickshire) as security for their patrimony, and Benlowes was again called on to carry out the duties of trustee.⁴

But amid the manifold duties of a man of property, Benlowes found time to devote to his chief interests—religion, poetry, and the arts. The qualities which have secured for him the interest of posterity—his mystical fervour and his poetic fancy—have no place in public records; but they have found a fitting monument in *Theophila*, and many among contemporary writers celebrated his gifts. Mr. Niemeyer shows how his generosity, his patronage, or his encouragement were acknowledged by Phineas Fletcher, Francis Quarles, Alexander Ross, Clement Paman, James Howell, and Payne Fisher. James Howell pays, however, more tribute than is contained in his poem *Upon Mr. Benlowes' Divine Theophila*. In a letter dated from the Fleet, August 25, 1645, he thanks Benlowes for the gift of a table of exquisite Latin poems. He also thanks him for visiting him in prison and for "other fair respects," including the present of a copy of Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island*.⁵ Fuller, in dedicating to Benlowes the sixth section of his *History of the University of Cambridge*, calls him his benevolent Mæcenas; so he, too, may have enjoyed Benlowes' generosity. Writers of distinction who also paid Benlowes enthusiastic tribute, though they, no doubt, had no need of his patronage, included William Davenant and John Gauden, the author of *Eikon Basilike*, who, as Dean of Bocking, was a neighbour of Benlowes.⁶ One of the most comprehensive eulogies

¹ See his will at Somerset House, 111 Russell.

² Close Rolls, 11 Chas. I, Part I, 17.

³ *Ibid.*, 22 Chas. I, Part VIII, 41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1649, Part XLVI, 23.

⁵ *Epistolæ Ho-eliae*, Book II, lxiv.; ed. Jacobs, pp. 489-90.

⁶ Gauden was also associated with Benlowes in affairs, and was party to the

is that of Ralph Winterton in his dedication to Benlowes of *The Considerations of Drexelius upon Eternity*, where he praises the piety and temperance of Benlowes' life and the charity and bounty that did honour to his station, and says that scholars abroad as well as at Cambridge enjoyed his liberality.

Poetry was not the only one of the arts in which Benlowes was interested. Wood tells us that he also patronized musicians,¹ amongst whom was especially John Jenkins, one of the most esteemed musicians of the period, who composed airs for parts of *Theophila*. Wood gives one to understand that Jenkins lived for a time in Benlowes' house.² A musician of less note who benefited by Benlowes' generosity was one William Collins; when Benlowes finds it necessary to assert in 1657 that he has not granted this man an annuity,³ one naturally infers that he had at least made Collins fairly regular gifts.

Most of Benlowes' published works show him to have been keenly interested in design, and the splendid edition of *Theophila* vouches for an interest in all the arts that make for beautiful book-production. He seems to have had a special fondness for engraving. In his own house he had a rolling-press for taking prints from engraved plates of brass or copper, and would seem therefore to have been himself an amateur engraver. He made use of Schoren, a printer by trade, to work the rolling-press and also to help him in gilding and painting.⁴

In 1635 Benlowes was associated with the establishment of an annual lectureship at the Royal College of Physicians. Dr. Theodore Goulston, who died on May 4, 1632, by his will bequeathed to the College £200 to buy some land or a rent-charge which was to provide funds for this purpose. Eventually Ellen Goulston, the doctor's widow, used the £200 to buy from Benlowes an annuity of £12, chargeable upon Benlowes' manor of Fennes, which should provide for a lecture to be given annually by one of the four youngest doctors in the College.⁵ On Benlowes' part this may have been

sale of Benlowes' estates, when, on May 11th, 1657, Nathan Wright bound himself to Gauden in the sum of £6000 to pay the purchase money in full. (Chancery Proceedings, Bridges 444/123.)

¹ *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 338.

² *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. Clark, ii. 335.

³ Chancery Proceedings, Collins 140/147 (answer).

⁴ *Ibid.*, Reynardson 31/14 (answer).

⁵ *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Legal and other Documents in the Archives of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, pp. 82, 247 ff.

merely a business affair ; but since the College had sought for some time without success to obtain a suitable piece of land and Benlowes was therefore helping Goulston's widow out of a difficulty, it may have been his enthusiasm for learning that induced him to take part in the foundation of this lectureship.

In intellectual and artistic pursuits lay Benlowes' natural interests. His nature demanded nothing better than a life of untroubled quiet, so that he might give himself over to study, to literature and the arts, and to religious meditation. The "Peroratio Eucharistica" at the end of *Theophila* shows his delight in having, after the exertions of Continental travel, and in times of grave disturbance, an interval of quiet peace to devote himself to the study of the divine laws ; and in the concluding lines of his *magnum opus* he looks to a life among the massed volumes of the Bodleian as an ideal existence.¹ His characteristic, then, is the description of him during his last years at Oxford in the letter of Bishop Fell to Sir Joseph Williamson, cited by Mr. Niemeyer.² Undisturbed by his extreme poverty, he finds in poetry his chief pleasure. Relieved of the anxieties of property and all the cares of the man of the world, which his social position thrust upon him though his nature fitted him ill to sustain them, now in his old age, when his poetic powers are declining, when all worldly fortune has deserted him, now only does he come near to achieving the life of peaceful seclusion for which his soul has always yearned.

¹ Saintsbury, *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, i. 472.

² Who, however, as with the letter of Dr. Thomas Barlow to Williamson, quotes only the description in the Calendar of State Papers, not the letter itself.

THE PLAYERS IN NORWICH, 1710-1750

BY SYBIL ROSENFELD

IN my former article on the Norwich stage¹ I left the players in 1709, once more facing opposition from the town authorities, I noted that henceforward they disappeared from the Court Books of the city, and in order to follow their subsequent history I have had recourse to the local newspapers. Fortunately there is an almost complete series of *Norwich Gazettes* for the period 1710-1750; and this paper not only regularly advertised performances in great detail but often provided news paragraphs of the movements of the Norwich Company on tour. The Norwich Public Library possesses copies of *Cross-grove's News* or *The Norwich Gazette* from November 16, 1728, and the *Norwich Mercury* for 1727. For the earlier year I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. A. J. Quinton, who has been good enough to search the volumes of the *Norwich Gazette* from December, 1710-January, 1712, January, 1716-March, 1718, and January, 1721-1727, in the Colman Library at Crown Point for items of theatrical interest; and to Mr. Noel-Hill, who has kindly sent extracts from his collection of *Norwich Gazettes* for December, 1722-July, 1723. Except, then, for the gaps 1712-16 and 1718-21, the records are complete. I have thought it best to deal with the years up to 1718 in detail, since nothing has been written on this early time; the later period I have treated as a unity under headings of (a) The Companies, (b) Theatres and Staging, (c) The Audience, (d) Plays.

1710-1718

The first available advertisement is that of the *Norwich Gazette* of December 9-16, 1710, which reads: "At the Queen's Arms on Monday next will be acted a Trajedy call'd Mackbeth, with all the Witches, Songs and Dances as they were originally perform'd at the Theatre Royal in London. Beginning at Five a Clock. Vivat Regina."

¹ *R.E.S.*, xii., 46, 129.

There are several points of interest. It is the first time we hear of acting taking place at the Queen's Arms ; in the preceding period we have mention of the White Swan, Red Lion, Angel, and the Duke of Norfolk's Palace. The performance began at five o'clock, an hour or two earlier than in following years. As for the play, the decorations appear to have been the chief attraction in Davenant's operatic version of *Macbeth*. That Norwich as well as London was to be lured by song and dance is borne out by an advertisement of the first performance there of Settle's *Heir of Morocco* in the same season : " With several Entertainments of Singing, particularly that pleasant Entertainment of the Country Wedding, and the Song of Genius of England." Whether these entertainments were performed between the acts of the tragedy or after it or both, it is not possible to say, but they prepare the way for the vicious practice of the afterpiece and of song and dance turns between the acts. In this same season, at the presentation of Trapp's *Abra-Mule* " our last new farce called the Walking Statue " was given before the tragedy. Aaron Hill's *Walking Statue* had only been produced in London in January, 1710, so that Norwich did not have to wait long to see the latest hit. Other plays advertised are *The Committee*, Shadwell's adaptation of *Timon of Athens*, and *King Lear and his three Daughters*, probably in Tate's version. The predominance of Shakespeare in the repertoire is noticeable.

The company, which stayed about six weeks, included one Kerregan, who acted the part of " Mad Tom " in *King Lear* for his own benefit. Kerregan appears again in Norwich in the winter season 1711-12 with " the Duke of Norfolk's Servants." From this, and from the fact that their repertoire is partly the same, we may conclude that it was likewise the Duke's Company that had been playing in 1710-11. But in 1711-12 they acted at the Duke's Palace for five weeks, playing four or five days in the week. They presented *The Indian Emperor* (twice), *The Rover*, Rowe's *Tamerlane the Great*, *The Tender Husband*, *Abra-Mule*, *The Busie-Body*, *The Heir of Morocco*, *The Recruiting Officer*, *Othello*, *Love for Love*, *Injured Love* (which had only been brought out at Drury Lane in April, 1711), *Macbeth*, *The Country Wit*, *Hamlet*, *Tunbridge Walks* (twice), *Amphitryon*, *The Unhappy Favourite* (in which Kerregan played Essex), *The Rival Queens*, and " a Masque of Musick call'd the Country Wedding," Ravenscroft's *London Cuckolds* was down for the last night " unless any other be desired." It is a large and

comprehensive repertoire in which tragedy and comedy are well balanced.

Among the actors was Benjamin Griffin, who ran away from his apprenticeship with a glazier in Norwich and thence joined the strollers, "with whom and in other companies, he arrived at considerable excellence" until, in 1714, he was engaged at Lincoln's Inn Fields and made a name as a low comedy actor and as an author of farces.¹

The next season in which we can trace the players is that of 1716, when they acted at the King's Arms, on January 16, J. Phillips' new farce *The Earl of Mar Marr'd*, which had been printed in 1715 but of whose production in London we have no record. This performance provoked a Jacobite riot, described in the *Gazette*, December 14-16, 1716:

When the Part of Proclaiming the Pretender as King was acted on the Stage and the Players gave a Formal Huzza at it, the People also in the Galleries gave a great Shout; whereupon Capt. Hall and some other Gentlemen well affected to King George, began to Hiss at 'em, at which they not only shouted louder but clapp'd their Hands, and stamp'd with their Feet to that Degree, that the House rang again: Upon that the Gentlemen drew their Swords and cry'd out, Down with the Rebels! Down with them! Damn 'em we'll Marr 'em. Which set the Ladies a shrieking, and put the House in Disorder. On Tuesday Night the said Farce was play'd again, and the Audience in the Galleries not only shouted as they did before, but had the Impudence to Hiss at what was spoken of his Most Sacred Majesty King George. Good Lord what a sad age we live in.

We do not know whether it was the regular or an amateur company that acted, at the King's Arms on July 3, *Marry or Do Worse*, "at the Request of the Gentlemen in Town," for the benefit of the charity schools, nor who was responsible for the "Two New and Very Diverting Farces the one *The Lunatic*, the other, *The Rival Fool*, or *Witty Factor*," the performance of which at the King's Arms was advertised for November 6. Singing and dancing between the plays and "a new humorous Epilogue spoken by Two Persons, which was made and presented to the Company by a young Lady" were additional attractions on the latter occasion.

In 1717 the Duke of Norfolk's Company of Comedians gave at "the White-Horse at Troas" (viz. Trowse, just outside the city)

¹ See *Biographica Dramatica*.

from February 25 to 29, five plays: *Sir Courtly Nice*, *Sir Harry Wildair*, *The Fair Penitent*, *Don Quixote*, and *The Distressed Mother*.

The 1718 season lasted from January 27 until March 17 and opened at the King's Arms at "the Request of divers Gentlemen and Ladies" with "the celebrated Play of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark." *The Inconstant* was given the second week at the request of "the Young Gentlemen of this City who lately Play'd several Comedies for their Diversion and converted Money arising from the same to Charitable uses." *The Rival Queens* was revived "With all new Habits proper to the Play being the Finest and Richest that were ever seen upon a Stage in this City." Kerregan chose for his benefit *Love and a Bottle*, which had never been played in Norwich. The announcement adds, "They will begin early by Reason the House will be Extreame full; this being the last week of their acting in Town." After performing *The Recruiting Officer* on the Saturday they finished the season with J. D. Breval's *The Play is the Plot*, which had been first given at Drury Lane only a month previously. The company then, though it acted mostly old plays, was also able to present from time to time the latest from London.

COMPANIES 1721-50

In 1721 we find a company calling themselves the Duke of Richmond's Servants at the King's Arms. Beyond the fact that this company had produced Tony Aston's *Pastora: or, The Coy Sheperdess*¹ in Tunbridge Wells as far back as 1712, we know nothing of them. At the same time Tollett and Thompson's medley was giving puppet shows at the White Swan Playhouse. An unnamed company, possibly again the Duke of Richmond's, was at the King's Arms the following winter, presented *Caius Marius* for the first time in Norwich, and revived *Venice Preserved*, which was advertised as "not play'd here these 20 years." Since *Caius Marius* was again in the programme it was probably the same company which returned the next winter and acted at the Angel. They also presented Steele's *Conscious Lovers*, "which was described as "Never acted out of London. . . . With a New Prologue and Epilogue, written by a Gentleman of this Town." By 1723 Tollett of the puppets had started a legitimate company:

Norwich Feb. 23. I have an Account, That Mr. Tollett is Coming with a New Company of Comedians to Act in this City, having obtain'd

¹ See t.p., 1712 edition.

Mr. Mayor's leave for that End : By Reports of Divers Persons who have seen them perform in Boston, Lincoln and other places, they are the Completest Company that ever Stroled : I hear that there are among them the famous Mr. SPILLER and his wife, and several other fine actors from the Playhouse in London, besides the most Curious Dancers that ever travelled. It seems they were last at Rochester, where they perform'd with great Applause, and on the 13th instant hired a ship to bring them to Norwich, and they are hourly now expected.¹

Acts of God prevented their appearance until June, as we learn from the *Gazette* of May 25-June 1 :

Notice is hereby given, That Mr. Tollett's Company of Comedians embarqu'd last Sunday at Whitstable for Norwich, and then waited only for a fair wind, being desirous the City should see how much a completer Company they are. . . . They intended to have been at Norwich last February but meeting with a terrible Storm at Sea, they were then prevented. . . . Henry Tollett.

The company opened at the King's Arms on June 10 and stayed until August 10, the longest season that Norwich had yet known. James Spiller, the low comedian from L.I.F., played, among other parts, those of the Elder Clincher in *The Constant Couple*, Young Hobbs in Doggett's farce of *The Country Wake*, and the Sham Doctor in *The Anatomist*. The new play of the season was *Whig and Tory*, a comedy by Benjamin Griffin.²

Three months after Tollett had departed "Mr. Keregans Company of Comedians" opened at the White Swan Playhouse. Tollett, who seems to have had the knack of self-advertisement, thereupon put a notice in the *Gazette* of November 30-December 3 :

Being Credibly inform'd, That my adversaries have rais'd malicious Falsehoods of me in order to promote their own Ends ; and that they report, that my Company will not be in Norwich this Christmas season ; This is to satisfie the Publick, That I have hired a Vessel for that Purpose, and hope to be at Norwich in a few Days ; and question not but to give the City greater Satisfaction, than any Company has ever done since Mr. Doggett's time.

He in fact opened at the King's Arms on December 30 and stayed until April 11, 1724. In the company were Morris, James, Jones, Dyer, Price, Paul, Williams, Mrs. Dyer, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Gale, Mrs. Howard, and Mrs. Tollett. Norwich profited in dramatic entertainment out of the rival companies.

A company not named, but presumably Tollett's, since he was

¹ *Norwich Gazette*, Feb. 16, 1723.

² See *ante*, p. 287.

at Beccles the week after, played during Assize Week from July 25 at the White Swan, but Kerregan was acting there as Justice in *Æsop* on October 3. In 1725 Kerregan had a winter season at the King's Arms whilst a company which included Paul, Collier, Green, Penkethman,¹ and Mrs. Frisby, from the Dublin Theatre, played "with an entire Sett of New Scenes never before put up" during Assize Week at the White Swan. Mrs. Bedingfield thus describes her visit to the play to Mrs. Howard:²

The house was too small for the actors; but a trap-door opened, and four of the company fell in—one a particular man, who was high-sheriff last year, fell upon a pretty woman, and liked his situation so well, that they could not get him out.

The following year "the Norwich Company of Comedians" acted the winter season at the White Swan. Frisby, Buck,³ James, Mrs. Frisby, Mrs. Plomer from L.I.F., Green, and Marshall were the chief actors. They returned "at the Request of a great number of Gentlemen and Ladies" during Assize Week and, "all possible Care" being "taken to secure a very strong, commodious Building for their Reception," performed at the King's Arms. Here at last was a permanent company which played almost every winter season and Assize Week, and were trumpeted in the *Gazette* of December 17-24, 1726, by the paragraph:

I hear that Preparations are making for the Reception of our Norwich Company of Comedians at the King's Arms Playhouse in this City and that (according to the Provisions they are making for themselves) 'tis the general opinion they will make the most splendid Appearance that was ever seen on the Norwich Stage.

On the last night of Assize Week, 1727, at the King's Arms, the company presented Welsted's *Dissembled Wanton*, advertised as having had a London run of fifteen nights. In the October of this year the *Ipswich Journal* announces (Oct. 7-14): "The Norwich Company of Comedians are Divided." The Greens' party, which kept the name of the Norwich Company, was the first to play in the

¹ William Penkethman, "the flower of Bartholomew Fair," whose name disappears from D.L. after 1724. His sojourn with the Norwich company was brief, as he died on September 20, 1725. See *Norwich Gazette*, Sept. 18-25.

² Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk, 1824, vol. i, p. 257.

³ Timothy Buck appears in a list of actors at L.I.F., April, 1722, see F. Fitzgerald, *A New History of the English Stage*, vol. i, p. 416. In July, 1715, a benefit had been given there to release him from prison; see Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*.

city at the White Swan in 1728. With the Greens were the Pauls and the Bowmans,¹ and in addition the company included the Merediths, West, Duckworth, Mynn (who had been in Doggett's company), Barret, Mrs. Bray, and Mrs. Potter. The new plays presented were Frowde's *Fall of Saguntum*, *The Provoked Husband*, advertised as having been performed for thirty-two successive nights at Drury Lane, and *The Beggars' Opera* "With the Scenes, Musick, Singing and Dancing as perform'd at the Theatre in London."

During Assize Week "The Norwich OLD Company of Comedians (late separated from Mr. Green)" were billed to appear. This troupe included the Frisbys, the Bucks, the Milwards, the James, Marshall, Mrs. Plomer, and the Pauls, who had deserted the Greens sometime before.² The quarrel had been made up by October,³ and on November 23 a reporter in the *Gazette* writes:

I am inform'd that our Norwich Company of Comedians have (since their Union) perform'd the Beggars' Opera after the new Manner . . . and some who pretend to be Judges, and have seen the same Performance at London, give our Company the Preference.

The united company was playing in Ipswich from November 11 and included Frisbys, James, Pauls, Bowmans, West, Marshall, Platt, Mrs. Bray, and Mrs. Jackson; the Greens do not appear again.

During 1729 at the White Swan *The False Friend*, "With a Prologue to the Town (particularly applicable to the Trade of this City)," *The Quakers' Opera*, which had originated in a booth in Southwark Fair, and *The Victim* were given first performances, and in July *The Village Opera*, "With all the proper Decorations and Musick as lately Performed at the New-House" was announced.

¹ It is unlikely that this was Betterton's adopted daughter and her husband as has been supposed. In favour of the supposition is the fact that Bowman's name disappears after 1738 and we know he died, aged eighty-eight, in March, 1739 (*London Daily Post*, March 26). He is referred to as "belonging to Drury Lane Theatre" in this notice. Bowman was acting at D.L. as the Ghost in *Timoleon*, January 26, 1730, and the Norwich Bowman as Iago on January 18. The Norwich actor again played Iago on January 20, 1735, whilst his Drury Lane namesake played Count Baldwin in *The Fatal Marriage* on January 23. It is difficult to believe that a man over eighty would rush from one theatre to another in this way, or that his wife would be playing such parts as Millamant or Shakespeare's Isabella in 1748. The Norwich actor was possibly the "Young Bowman" who was acting at Drury Lane in 1715-16.

² By March 27, when Paul played Polonius at Ipswich with the old company. *Ipswich Journal*, March 18-23.

³ When a united company was acting at Colchester. *Ipswich Journal*, October 19-26.

The next year the company styled itself "Servants to His Grace the Duke of Grafton, Lord Chamberlain of His Majesty's Household."¹ They played at the King's Head but thereafter made the White Swan their permanent playhouse. Pitt, from the Theatre Royal, who was with the company as late as 1743, and one Woodward² "from London," joined the troupe in the 1730-31 winter season. The only new play was B. Martyn's *Timoleon*. During 1732 Betterton's *Amorous Widow*³ and Mallett's *Eurydice* were given. 1733 was a notable year in the company's annals: "'tis believed they will be more Splendid than for many Years past," reports the *Norwich Mercury* for December 16-23, 1732. They introduced to Norwich Banks' *Mary Queen of Scots*, Steele's *Tender Husband*, and Kelly's *Married Philosopher*, and for the first time in their history, though not for the first time in Norwich, played Tate's version of *King Lear*. In June the company lost West, who died, aged thirty-two, and was buried in the churchyard of St. Peter Mancroft. The company had a month's summer season, starting during Sessions Week, in which they produced Fielding's *The Miser*.

The activities of a rival company gave cause for the following declaration to appear in the *Gazette* of July 6-13, 1734:

Whereas for some Time past, a small Body of People have been at several Towns in the County of Norfolk, and call themselves a Company of Comedians, and report that they have some Concerns with the Proprietor of his Grace the Duke of Grafton's Company, in order to gain Credit, and impose upon the Publick: These are therefore to prevent such Abuses for the future (by signifying to his Majesty's Justices of the Peace, Bayliffs, High Constables, etc. to whom such Persons may apply for leave to Play) That no Company or Body of People who travel about in this Country, have any Protection or Patent from his Grace the Duke of Grafton (or any other Authority) but those who for many Years past have been call'd the Norwich Company, of which Mr. William James is now Manager thereof.

The other company was probably that of Bainbridge, in which Upton, the Wheelers, and Mrs. Daniel played at Holt in July, having

¹ The Duke had been a patron of the Norwich drama in the early years of the century; he became Lord Chamberlain in 1724.

² It has generally been assumed that this was the famous Henry Woodward. This, however, is not possible, as his name appears regularly with the Norwich Company until 1743, whereas Henry Woodward joined the D.L. company in 1738 and played there regularly until 1741, when he transferred to Covent Garden. Henry Woodward played Spruce in *The Independent Patriot* at L.I.F. on February 12, 1737, whilst the Norwich actor had his benefit on February 14.

³ Though advertised as "never played in the City before," it had been given by Tollett's Company, December 30, 1723: "not play'd in this City for a great many Years last past."

"lately had the Honour to be Encouraged by several Noblemen and Persons of Distinction in this County."

Mrs. Schoolding's name first appears in 1734 and in January 1735 "'tis assur'd that Mr. Roberts (from the Theatre-Royal) will perform the Character of Justice Ballance :¹ for which 'tis reasonable to believe that the Character was never so well personated in this City before." Roberts also played Othello to the Iago of Bowman and the Desdemona of Mrs. Bowman, and spoke a new Prologue to the City before *Abra-Mule*.

Giles, Bawtree, and Mr. and Mrs. St. Nicholas are the new actors in 1736, whilst Aaron Hill's *Zara* and Fielding's *Pasquin*, which had "met with the greatest Encouragement of any other [entertainment] on the English Stage in the Memory of Man, having exceeded the Beggars' Opera in its Run by 5 Nights," are the new plays.

In 1737 died Henrietta Maria Bray, aged sixty, who was buried in St. Peter Mancroft in November, and Ann Buck, aged thirty-two, whose quaint epitaph at Colchester reads :

Having acted a good Part
On the Stage of Life for 32 Years,
And on that of the Theatre for 14 years. . . .
She made a most decent Exit.

An accident to Mrs. Bowman is reported on December 15-17 :

The Report of the Death of Mrs. Bowman, the fam'd Actress in the Norwich Company of Comedians, is not true, for since the Waggon went over her Body going from Bury Fair to Colchester, she is so well recover'd as to Play almost every Night.

In spite of these misfortunes the company gave the following new plays : Mrs. Haywood's *Wife to be Let*, Young's *The Revenge*, and Havard's *King Charles I*. The company did not open until January 31 in 1738, and Norwich had to console itself for the delay with Woodham and Frost's waxworks at the Star and Sheppard's puppets at the Red Lion. James, too, was evidently dead, as henceforward there is always a benefit performance for the Widow James. Upton, from Bainbridge's company, was a new recruit. New plays were Popple's *Lady's Revenge*, Miller's hash of *Much Ado*, with *La Princesse d'Elide* called *The Universal Passion*, and *Oroonoko*.

The year 1739 was another outstanding one in the company's history. On January 6-13 the *Gazette* announces that the comedians

¹ In *The Recruiting Officer*.

"will shortly be here, and open the House in a very grand Manner, with the Play of King Henry the Fourth." Great preparations for new scenery were in hand at the White Swan and money was lavished on scenes and clothes for the new plays: Rowe's *Royal Convert*, Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity*, and Mallett's *Mustapha*. Drury and the Slaters had joined the company.

In 1740 no less than five new pieces came out: E. Smith's *Phædra and Hippolytus*, *Measure for Measure*, Sewell's *Sir Walter Raleigh*, Centlivre's *The Man's Bewitched* and Lillo's *Elmerick*. Whoever was James' successor as manager of the company was an enterprising man.

As You Like It and *Twelfth Night* were given for the first time in Norwich in 1741, and Crouse made his début at the White Swan as Hamlet. Buck, who used to supplement his income by teaching small-sword and quarter-staff to the gentlemen of the cities which he visited, must have died about 1741-2, as a benefit was given for his orphan in January, 1742. Trouble must have arisen or been anticipated under the Licensing Act of 1737, and for the Assize season the White Swan was adapted for concerts, and plays were advertised as being performed gratis between the two parts of the concert, an evasion resorted to by many minor theatres. This procedure, however, was dropped the following winter season. The names of Pierce, from Goodman's Fields, Stevens, Stone, and the Waldegraves¹ appear in the casts and Roberts again played in the company. Anne Roberts died in this year aged thirty. Cibber's *Lady's Last Stake* and Fielding's *Wedding Day* were the only new presentations in 1743. In 1744 Stevens played Macbeth, and in 1745 Beaufort and Brock first appeared. In the latter year Hurst's *Roman Maid* and Thomson's *Sophonisba* were given. For some reason there does not seem to have been a winter season in Norwich in 1746, but in this year Pearson, Peterson, Hicks, and Mrs. Hill and in 1747 Julian and Mrs. Sunderland joined the company.

In June, 1747, with fresh scenes and rich clothes, Macklin came from Drury Lane with part of his London company to entertain Norwich in a newly fitted-out White Swan. The company, which included Taswell, Cashel,² Luke and Isaac Sparks, Mills, Mrs.

¹ There was a Waldegrave in the company in 1728.

² Oliver Cashel, an Irishman and a personal friend of Macklin's, died during the season at Norwich, being "taken speechless on the Stage in the Part of Frankly, in a Comedy call'd The Suspicious Husband. He was carried to his Lodgings where Physicians and Surgeons attended but to no Purpose; for he expired in a

Elmy,¹ and the Mozeens,² stayed, acting every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, until the beginning of September. Among Macklin's parts were those of Ben in *Love for Love*, the Miser, Teague in *The Committee*, Shylock, Polidore in *The Orphan*, Bräss in *The City Wives Confederacy*, Lord Foppington in *The Careless Husband*, Sir Harry Wildair in *The Constant Couple*, Sir Gilbert Wrangle in *The Refusal*, and Fondlewife in *The Old Batchelor*. It is interesting to read that Macklin took the part of a carrier in *Henry IV*, leaving Hotspur to Cashel and the Prince to Mills.

In November, 1747, at the return of the Norwich Company, a benefit was given for Mr. and Mrs. Dancy, "formerly belonging to Mr. Carragan's Company of Comedians who are reduced very low by long Sickness"; old stagers were not forgotten.

During 1748 *Henry V*, as altered by Hill, was first performed in Norwich with Peterson as the King. For the July season the company "fitted up the Play-House at the Red-Lyon in St. Stephen's in a Commodious Manner . . . and as the Company is altered much to Advantage in their Performances they make no doubt of giving intire Satisfaction." The following year they returned to the White Swan producing there *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* and *Oedipus*.³

The company used then to play in Norwich for about three or four months at the beginning of the year and from a week to three weeks during the Assizes in July and August. Their visitations to other towns were frequently arranged to coincide with fairs or races, when multitudes would gather. During the period the towns in the circuit varied. In 1727 after leaving Norwich in March, the comedians spent part of April in North Walsham, May in Aylsham, June at the Holt races, then, after revisiting Norwich in August during Assize week, there came the split; the old company proceeded to Woodbridge and Green's company to Colchester in November for two weeks and then to Ipswich. It was the practice of the company to leave Norwich for a week during the winter

few Hours." W. R. Chetwood, *A General History of the Stage*, 1749, p. 125. See also *Norwich Gazette*, August 15-22, which gives the date of his seizure as August 17.

¹ See Genest, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 653, for her career.

² Mozeen, according to Chetwood, *op. cit.*, had "a good Person join'd to a genteel Education, Judgment, Voice and Understanding." Mrs. Mozeen, formerly Miss Edwards, was a protégée of Mrs. Clive and an adept in music; she is said to have been graced with a charming manner and voice.

³ Most likely Dryden and Lee's, but possibly Theobald's.

season to attend "Lynn Mart," Beccles was usually visited about May for the races, Ipswich in June or July, and Bury for the fair in September. The circuit in 1749, which must be almost complete, was as follows :

January-May	Norwich
June	Dereham for 3 weeks.
July	Ipswich (races).
August	Beccles.
September-October	Bury (fair).
October-December	Colchester.
December	Ipswich.

In the early part of the period Yarmouth was a regular circuit town, but there is no mention of it after 1742. Other places to which we can trace the company are Framlingham (1728), Cambridge (1731), where they performed for the benefit of sufferers by fire and gave £12 in addition to profits to the cause to make up an acceptable sum, Harleston (1734, 1737, 1748), Swaffham (1735), Thetford (1736), Fakenham (1743), Saxmundham (1743, 1745, 1747), Sudbury (1744), Hingham (1744), Walsingham (1748). Their stay varied from one week to four, but two to three weeks was the usual time allotted. These towns were no doubt visited more often than I have found trace of, but they do not seem to have been regularly included in the yearly tour. In one advertisement for Dereham, for instance, it is definitely stated that the company would not appear there for another two years.

The company played in Norwich four or five times a week except during Lent, when they played only twice. In the smaller towns they generally confined themselves to three days a week, but often advertised their willingness to give additional performances by special request. Benefits were regularly given for the actors and sometimes for victims of fire and other accidents. Command performances by local people of importance were an habitual feature both in Norwich and in other towns, and towards the end of the period the masons and other societies and clubs had special request performances.

There were other companies active in the district. We have already met that of Bainbridge at Holt in 1734. This company included a Mrs. Daniel and was probably that subsequently known as Daniel's Company, which acted at Holt in September, 1738, during the time of the races. A troupe including the Daniels, the

Cuthberts, the Hasleups, the Whitakers, and Freeman, who joined the Norwich Company in 1744, acted at the Tankard Street Theatre, Ipswich, twice a week for a month at the beginning of 1741. There was also Mr. Herbert's Company, which presented at St. George's Hall, King's Lynn, the operatic version of *The Tempest* with Barret as Prospero, Wignell as Ferdinand, and Mrs. Wignell as Miranda, and with "decorations all entirely new" on March 7, 1743. In December, 1744, this company was in Yarmouth playing *She Wou'd and She Wou'd Not*, and they reappeared at King's Lynn in February, 1745, February, 1746, and April, 1748. Besides the Herberts, the company included the Wheelers, who had been with Bainbridge, the Slaters, who were with the Norwich Company, 1739-41, and Brock, who joined the Norwich Company in 1745. Lastly, a third company known as Smith's, was acting at Hingham in July, 1749. It is of interest to note the interchange of actors between these lesser strollers and the Norwich Company.

A word must be added about the many companies of puppets and medleys that visited Norwich. Some of these came from the London fairs and entertained Norwich at Christmas time. That they were popular is attested by the statement on December 27, 1740, that 100 people were turned away every night from Frost and Rayner's puppet show, though two others were running concurrently in town. In the winter of 1733-4, too, the Italian rope dancer Signora Violante and company were at the Angel, John Karby and his puppets at the Red Lion, and Plat and Godwin's Medley from London at the Rampant Horse. Waxworks, drolls, dancing, acrobatic feats, and conjuring were the staple entertainments offered by these companies. Drolls such as *Jephtha's Rash Vow* or *Princess Elizabeth*, acts from operas or from comedies, and one-act ballad operas like *Damon and Phillida* were performed.

THEATRES AND STAGING

The chief theatre in Norwich was the White Swan Playhouse,¹ which was situated near the west end of St. Peter Mancroft. The auditorium consisted of the stage, pit, and first, or under, and upper galleries. In 1739 great improvements were made:

I hear that great Preparations are making for Opening the White-Swan Playhouse on Monday Se'nnight next: and that the Fine Sett of Scenes

¹ For a view of the exterior see frontispiece to T. L. G. Burley's *Playhouses and Players in East Anglia*. The inn has long since been pulled down.

Painted by the Famous French Painter Devoto¹ are arriv'd, in order to be put up against that Time: the Motto on which is *Speculum Vitæ* (Jan. 20-27).

The opening performance had to be postponed until the Tuesday because "the Paintings would scarcely be dry before that Time; when every Person may expect to see the most compleat Appearance that was ever seen in this Town." Commodious boxes were erected for the ladies. In 1742 further alterations were made: "the White Swan Play-House is finished up so well, as to make it capable of entertaining the finest Musical Hands for Concerts, as well as Playing" (July 31-August 7). In the winter we learn "the House is ceiled, and made very warm." For Macklin's visit in 1747 the playhouse was again improved: "Their Scenes are painted by the best Hands in London, and are entirely New; their Clothes Rich and Elegant; and for the better Accommodation of the Audience, they have alter'd and fitted up the House in a Commodious and Theatrical Manner" (June 13-23). In 1749 occurs the first mention of upper boxes. The White Swan continued to be the regular playhouse of the Norwich Company until the new theatre was built in 1758.

The Angel, the gallery of which had fallen down at a performance in 1699, was reconstructed in 1722, and an announcement appeared on December 15:

The Play House at the Angel in the Market Place being new built by Mr. Starling the Carpenter, for the reception of Gentlemen, Ladies and others; This is to give notice that such care is taken by the said Mr. Starling for the Strength and security of the Galleries, etc., that there will be no reason to fear any Danger, as has been maliciously insinuated: and he, the said Mr. Starling, will give further Satisfaction to any person or persons who desire it.

The Angel was thereafter used by puppet shows and medleys.

The matter of heating was a vital one and notices similar to the following, for the Red Lion, 1734, are of frequent occurrence in the *Gazette*: "That the Gentry may not be incommoded with Cold, there are Contrivances to keep the House Warm." That this was done in very simple fashion is evident from an advertisement from a *Norwich Gazette* of 1725²: "The pit is lined, and there are boxes on the stage for the better reception of gentlemen and ladies.

¹ Scene-painter to the London theatres.

² Quoted by the *Norfolk Weekly Standard and Argus*, September 29, 1894.

There will be two fires kept on the stage during the time of performance that the room may be warm." In 1730 the room at the Red Lion was made "more commodious then ever" and in 1748 it was again refitted for the Norwich Company to perform there during the Assizes.

The one reference to lighting is in a notice of Tollett's Company at the King's Arms in December, 1723, wherein it is stated that "Mrs. Tollett . . . has been at the Charge of fixing Lamps, and other Conveniences more commodious than has formerly been."

We know that the company performed in Yarmouth in a warehouse until a theatre was fitted up for them in the Town Chamber¹; in Colchester at the Moot Hall; and in Ipswich in the Shire Hall in 1728, in a playhouse in St. Nicholas Street in 1733, in another in Griffin Yard in 1736, until one Betts built the New Theatre in Tankard Street. This was first used by puppet shows and then in 1739 by the players. Town Halls were in use at Sudbury and Beccles; the latter, as advertised in 1745, being "fitted up in an Elegant Manner" for the players' reception. A New Theatre arose in Saxmundham in 1745,² and the company announce in the *Ipswich Journal*, October 14, 1749, "that they intend to pleasure themselves by waiting on 'the Gentlemen and Ladies of Bungay' to open their theatre." Elsewhere the players had to make do with barns and booths, the latter often erected specially for them, as at Holt races in 1735.

The company's resources with regard to scenery and clothes seem to have been greater than those of most strolling companies. Throughout the period there are constant announcements both of new plays and revivals "with Scenes and Clothes entirely new" or with "all new scenes and decorations" or "with proper Dresses for the Play entirely New." In 1729 *The Victim* was brought out, not only "With the Original Sacrifice Scene new set to Musick" but "with Habits entirely new, by much the Richest ever seen in the Country." In 1739 *Henry IV* was performed in the "grand manner" and new scenes and clothes were provided for *King John*, *The Way of the World*, *The Royal Convert*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Ten years later *The Siege of Damascus* was "decorated with the Elegance of these Times" whilst *Cædipus* was "decorated after an entire New Method" and included a grand procession,

¹ See T. L. G. Burley, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

² See *Ipswich Journal*, August 10.

transparent paintings, scenes, machines, flyings, and sinkings. The flyings and sinkings had already been used in *Amphitryon* in 1736,¹ and in 1744 the actors reminded their patrons that they had been "at an Extraordinary Expence for Machinery."

Adventitious music and dancing were popular. *Macbeth* was done "With all the Witches,"² Musick, Singing, Dancing and all other Decorations as performed at the Theatre Royal." In 1726 *Mithridates* was newly dressed "with Scenes and other Decorations as perform'd in the Royal Theatre at London," whilst in 1735 *Theodosius* was accompanied by "all the Musick, Vocal and Instrumental as perform'd at the Theatre in London," and *Henry IV* in 1743 "With the Prologue, Epilogue, and all the Songs as usually perform'd at the Theatres in London on the like Occasion." Attempts at historic accuracy were occasionally made. The *Ipswich Journal* advertises *Cato* on June 30, 1739, as "With New Roman and Numidian Dresses proper to the Play," and *The Rival Queens* on September 2, 1749, with a procession "adorn'd with Lictors with their Fasces, Trophies, Standard-Bearers, Prisoners of War and all other pompous Solemnities suitable to the Occasion." The services of supers must have been enlisted for this and similar spectacles. Neither were prologues and epilogues neglected, and in Restoration fashion Miss Frisby spoke epilogues in boys' clothes and Giles in 1736 delivered Haines' notorious epilogue on an ass. Special epilogues of thanks were usually addressed to the town before departure.

When a great scenic effort had been made prices were often raised. The cost of seats varied, but the normal charge seems to have been: pit and stage 2s. 6d. or 2s., first gallery 1s. 6d. or 1s., upper gallery 6d. For the first performance of *Mary Queen of Scots* the company begged leave "to make the Price of the Stage 3s. to prevent the Scenes being overcrowded." Yet in 1739 the usual charges of stage, 2s. 6d., pit 2s., first gallery 1s., and upper gallery 6d. are excused "on Account of the extraordinary Expence" of the production of *Henry IV*. In 1742 3s. was being charged for the stage and 2s. 6d. for the pit. Boxes for Macklin were 3s., but in 1749 2s. 6d., whilst upper boxes fetched 1s. 6d. At Bury the prices were much the same: stage 3s., pit 2s. 6d., first gallery 1s. 6d.,

¹ Chambers, *A General History of the County of Norfolk*, vol. ii, p. 1120.

² The Witches were performed by men in 1728, by three men and two women in 1733. The music was Leveridge's.

upper gallery 1s., or the boxes and pit were laid together at 2s. 6d.¹ At Aylsham in 1743 the pit and stage together were 2s. 6d. and the gallery 1s. Puppet shows charged only 1s. for the stage and provided other seats at 6d., 3d., and 2d. Tickets for plays were obtainable at the playhouses themselves or at other taverns and coffee-houses or sometimes at tradesmen's.

THE AUDIENCE

Disturbing customs similar to those that marred performances in the London theatres afflicted the provincial stage also.

Every endeavour was, however, made by local authorities to have good hours kept. Performances began at six, six-thirty, or seven o'clock, never later. The advertisements often announce the time of starting as being by command: "By positive command," reads one, "we are oblig'd to begin exactly at Six," or again "By command we shall either begin or shut up the Doors exactly at Six o'clock during the whole Season." Tollett in 1723 "resolved to begin constantly at 7 o'clock that the company may not be kept from going home too late." When the company visited a town during the races they started performing as soon as the racing was over in order to be done in time for the assembly. At other, smaller towns care was taken to announce, with unconscious poetry, that gentlemen and ladies at a distance would "in their Return have the Opportunity of the Moon."

Doors usually opened at four o'clock, sometimes at three o'clock, and during Macklin's season not until five o'clock. Ladies sent servants to keep places and one notice even reads, "Servants will be allowed to keep Places on the Stage." The iniquitous system of admitting people for half price or less after the second or third act prevailed, but efforts were made to put a stop to it later in the period. In 1741 an announcement appeared that "Nothing less than the full Price will be taken till after the 3rd Act," whilst the following year it was given out that "No less than the whole Money will be taken during the Performance." In 1745 nothing under half price was accepted after the end of the third act and Macklin would not permit entrance under full price at any time.

Another nuisance was the admission of spectators behind the scenes to sit on the stage. Though many and various were the

¹ *Ipswich Journal*, September 16 and 23, 1749.

prohibitions, the practice continued to flourish. In 1722 at a performance of *Venice Preserved* "The hurry of the play obliges us to desire no person to be on the Stage."¹ Notices at first were rather peremptory: "None to be admitted on the Stage" or "No Persons to be admitted behind the Scenes," but later the attitude was deferential and apologetic and the players "hope the Gentlemen and Ladies will not take it ill, if no one can be admitted on the Stage, more than the Seats will contain"; on another occasion the same formula was used when gentlemen were not to be admitted behind the Scenes whilst the boxes were at liberty.

Sometimes when only a small audience was assembled the players did not act, but this practice seems to have had the natural effect of keeping people away; so that on one occasion an announcement appeared that in order not to disappoint those living at a distance "the Company are resolv'd never to dismiss."² Another inconvenience was the last-minute alteration of the programme so that an audience come to see one play sometimes found the curtain rising on another; the actors were at last forced to announce that

As many Inconveniences have arose by altering Plays, or Entertainments, at a short Notice; these are to acquaint the Gentlemen and Ladies, that no other Play, or Farce can possibly be represented, after those publish'd in the Ipswich Journal, or specified in the Bills of the Day.³

The players were wont to be regulated in their choice of plays to some extent by requests. Innumerable performances are by the desire of ladies and gentlemen; in 1734, for example, the company was requested to return from Colchester "to their New Theatre at Bury, to perform a small Number of bespoke Plays." At Colchester they had performed before the Princess of Orange and a great audience. Patronised by royalty and leading county families such as the Berniers and Pettus's, the company's standard must have been fairly high. It is not likely that the gentry would have encouraged mere tattered strollers. Though the nobility and quality⁴ figure most freely in the advertisements, there is no doubt that merchants, too, were patrons, and George Barnwell is advertised

¹ Chambers, *op. cit.*

² *Ipswich Journal*, October 28, 1749.

³ *Ibid.*, December 2, 1749.

⁴ On occasion some city gallant would have a fancy to take part in the performance; one played, for instance, "for his Diversion" Leontine in *Theodosius* on August 4, 1735.

as meeting with "great Encouragement from the Merchants and Citizens of London," whilst Norwich trade was made the subject of a special prologue.

PLAYS

New plays were often given soon after they had seen the light in London. Thus Fielding's *Wedding Day*, given at Norwich in May, 1743, was announced as "acted at London this Winter with Applause." Havard's *King Charles I*, given in London on March 1, 1737, appeared in Norwich "As it is now Acting in London with great Applause," on April 11. *The Beggars' Opera*, which London had acclaimed in January, 1728, was presented in Norwich by April, and, "after the New Manner, at Bury, Colchester and Ipswich, with very great Applause" by November of that year.

Within the period 1721-50 seventeen of Shakespeare's plays were acted by the company, sixteen at Norwich, and *Romeo and Juliet* at Beccles. This includes the adaptations of *Macbeth*, *Timon*, *Lear*, and others but does not take account of such a hotch-potch as *The Universal Passion*. I can trace twelve performances¹ of *Macbeth*, eight of *Hamlet*, seven of *Timon*, five of *Henry IV*, *Richard III*, and *Othello*, and four of *Lear*, *Merchant or Jew of Venice*, and *As You Like It*. During these years *Henry IV*, *King John*, *Measure for Measure*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Henry V* were given first performances at Norwich. It is to be noted that the tragedies were more popular than the comedies and that more performances of *Macbeth* can be traced than of any full-length eighteenth-century play. It was no mean achievement to keep Shakespeare so constantly alive in the provinces.

Other Elizabethan plays that were performed were *The Maid's Tragedy*, *The Scornful Lady*, *The Chances*, *Rule a Wife*, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, and *The Royal Merchant*.²

Forty-three Restoration plays were given during these years of which we can trace the following number of performances: *The Constant Couple*, ten; *The Rival Queens*, nine (seven consecutive); *Love's Last Shift*, eight; *The Committee*, *Beaux Stratagem*, *Love*

¹ In estimating number of performances one must remember that the newspapers generally only advertised the play for the first day of the week. Very many more representations were given than we know of, but the proportion of times any particular play was given probably remains about the same. Unless otherwise stated I have counted performances in Norwich only.

² Altered by Henry Norris from *The Beggars' Bush*.

for *Love*, and *Oroonoko*, seven; *The Recruiting Officer* and *The Mourning Bride*, six; *The Relapse*, *The Provoked Wife*, *The Cheats of Scapin*, five; *Theodosius*, *The Spanish Friar*, and *Ædipus*, four. Comedy here was rightly preferred.

I have found mention of seventy-three full-length eighteenth-century plays, of which Steele's *Conscious Lovers* had eleven performances; *The Miser*, ten; *The Provoked Husband* and *The Careless Husband*, nine; *The Beggar's Opera* and *The Country Lassie*, eight; *Jane Shore* and *King Charles I*, six; *Cato*, *The Wife's Relief*, *Love Makes a Man*, Thomson's *Sophonisba*, five; and *The City Wives Confederacy*, *A Bold Stroke for a Wife*, and *The Double Gallant*, four.

Afterpieces were sometimes included in the programme as early as 1711, but were not advertised as a regular feature until 1730, after the success of *The Beggar's Opera* had established a vogue for ballad operas such as *Damon and Phillida* and *Flora*, which could be called "after the manner of *The Beggar's Opera*." There is evidence of the performance of sixty-one afterpieces in Norwich, and of these Carey's *Honest Yorkshireman* recurs most often, with eighteen representations, followed by *The Devil to Pay*, thirteen; *The King and the Miller of Mansfield*, *Damon and Phillida*,¹ *The Contrivances*, eleven; *The Rival Milliners*, nine; *The Lying Valet*, *The Stage-Coach*, *The What D'ye Call It*, eight; *Intrigues of Harlequin*, seven; *Bridegroom Bilked*, *Tom Thumb*, *The Mock Doctor*, and *Miss in Her Teens*, six.

Norwich did not lack variety in plays or players. Actors from London did not scorn to play in the company, and scenery and costumes were from time to time obtained from London theatres. The city was well served not by an itinerant band of impoverished strollers but by a company capable of showing its citizens the best in old and the latest in new drama.

For a theatre properly adapted to their needs they had to wait until 1758.

¹ The 1730 edition of Cibber's ballad opera "As perform'd by His Grace the Duke of Grafton's Servants, at the Theatre at Norwich" was altered by Frisby. (*Gazette*, January 24-31, 1730.)

ROBERT POTTER AS A CRITIC OF DR. JOHNSON

BY HERBERT G. WRIGHT

AMONG the critics of Dr. Johnson in the eighteenth century was Robert Potter, and his comments on the writings of his contemporary are not uninteresting. Potter was a country clergyman well versed in English literature and also in the classics. It was as a translator of Æschylus that he made his reputation, and his work brought him into contact with Mrs. Montagu. She esteemed his rendering of Æschylus highly, and urged him to go on to translate Euripides. By the year 1779 they were evidently on friendly terms and she had entered into correspondence with him. According to a tradition which there appears to be no reason to doubt, it was through her good offices that Potter made the acquaintance of Johnson, on the occasion of a visit of the translator to London. If the report be accurate, Johnson was in one of his unamiable moods and showed little consideration for either his hostess or his fellow guest.

At length Dr Johnson's name was announced. Mrs Montagu with all due form took Potter by the hand, and introduced him to Dr Johnson, by saying—"Dr Johnson, Mr Potter." Dr J. muttered out something like, "Well, well." Mrs M. thought that J. did not hear, and again said, "Mr Potter, Dr Johnson." Dr Johnson in the same sort of tone repeated his mutterings. Mrs M. was irritated at Dr J.'s apparent neglect of what she said, and still supposing that he did not hear the name of Potter mentioned, again said "Dr Johnson, Mr Potter the Translator of Æschylus." Dr J. then said—"Well, Madam, and what then?" Dr Parr thought that Dr J. had, on the first entrance of Mr Potter, seen something in his manner, which he did not like. When Potter saw Dr Parr after this circumstance, he in the simplicity of his heart said to him—"Well, I have seen your friend, Dr Johnson,"—he described him as a very cold-hearted man, of heartless manners, and then himself told the story, and seemed quite unconscious of Dr J.'s secret contempt.¹

¹ E. H. Barker, *Literary Anecdotes and Contemporary Reminiscences, of Professor Porson and others*, London, 1852, vol. i, pp. 1-2.

It is beyond question that Johnson esteemed Potter's translations but little. He contended that the proper way to judge such versions was to consider their effect as an English poem, and, viewed in this fashion, what he had read of Potter's Æschylus seemed to him mere verbiage. However, on the recommendation of James Harris, he promised to read one play, but begged him not to prescribe two.¹ The dislike thus incipient in 1778 had been confirmed by the following year, as may be seen from an incident recorded by Susan Burney. One morning that summer she followed her father into the library of the 'Thrales' house at Streatham and found Mrs. Thrale and Dr. Johnson, the latter just finishing his breakfast upon peaches. After the visitors had been welcomed, Johnson told Dr. Burney that Mrs. Thrale had desired Potter to translate some verses which he (Johnson) had previously undertaken to do. "How so?" asked Burney. "Why Mr. Potter?" "Nay, Sir, I don't know," replied Johnson; "it was Mrs. Thrale's fancy." Then Mrs. Thrale went to fetch the verses, which she had been copying out. They were handed to Burney, but he had only read the first stanza, when he exclaimed: "Why, these are none of Potter's; these are worse than Potter. They beat him at his own weapons." The truth was then revealed. Johnson had composed them the night before as a parody on Potter, and now laughed heartily over them, though he was unwilling to let them be copied, lest they should come into circulation, as his parody of Bishop Percy had formerly done.²

The authenticity of the tradition concerning Johnson's conduct on his introduction to Potter is corroborated by the latter's subsequent allusions to his discourtesy, though without specific reference to this episode. Thus in remarking how difficult it sometimes may be to reconcile the demands of friendship with those of candour and sincerity, Potter says: "What is good-breeding but deference; and deference but negative flattery? Lowering ourselves has the same effect as raising our companions; but common good-manners are too great a sacrifice for the self-importance of persons of these polished ages to make to society; but the mortification of the humble and meek, is a necessary ingredient in the practice of high breeding."³

¹ Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, Oxford, 1887, vol. iii, p. 256.

² Fanny Burney, *The Early Diary*, ed. A. R. Ellis, London, 1907, vol. ii, pp. 255-7.

³ *The Art of Criticism; as exemplified in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the most eminent English Poets*, London, 1789, p. 134.

The criticism is obvious in another passage, where Potter blames Johnson for casting mud on Mrs. Montagu's book and explains that "the true motive was probably her neglect of him, his savage manners not suiting her groupe of literati."¹ Potter would only be human, if he felt indignation at the treatment meted out to him, and with equal justification Mrs. Montagu might cherish some resentment on his behalf. There are indications that she discussed Johnson with Potter, and not altogether in his favour. In his *Lives of the Poets*² Johnson says of Shenstone's *Rural Elegance*: "I once heard it praised by a very learned lady," and he goes on to eulogize the same poet's *Pastoral Ballad* and asserts with regard to certain stanzas that "if any mind denies its sympathy, it has no acquaintance with love or nature." The learned lady was doubtless Mrs. Montagu, and in all likelihood it was she who inspired Potter's comment that Johnson had no perception of the beauty of these stanzas till it was pointed out to him.³

However, if Mrs. Montagu was not over-pleased with Johnson's demeanour to Potter, she was infuriated by his supercilious, almost contemptuous attitude towards her friend Lyttelton in the *Lives of the Poets*. An answer was forthcoming from Potter, who in 1783 published *An Inquiry into some Passages in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the Poets* and followed it up in 1789 with *The Art of Criticism; as exemplified in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the most eminent English Poets*. Horace Walpole heard that Potter's main object was to exact vengeance for the attack on Lyttelton, and that he wrote "at the instigation of Mrs. Montagu, who has had her full share of incense, and who, with insipid Bishop Hurd, is pronounced the two best critics of this or any age!"⁴ It is quite probable that the defence of Lyttelton was one of Potter's motives, but it would be wrong to conceive of him as a mere hireling, who did the bidding of fashionable and aristocratic literary circles. In his *Art of Criticism* he later on even indulged in some mild strictures on Mrs. Montagu's writing⁵ and, as will be seen, his tastes in literature ran counter to those of

¹ *The Art of Criticism*, p. 17.

² Vol. iv, pp. 352-3.

³ *The Art of Criticism*, p. 172.

⁴ Letter dated June 9, 1783. Cf. Horace Walpole, *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, vol. xiii, p. 5.

⁵ On p. 15, while praising a passage in her remarks on blank verse in her discussion of Corneille's *Cinna*, he found fault with it as being "embarrassed with a pedantic superabundance of comma's, which, multiplied, are often productive of confusion instead of clearness."

Johnson and so he had good cause for wishing to cross swords with him.

Most of his life was spent in the country and he had a genuine love of nature, which distinguishes him from "the smooak-loving Johnson." His delight in the opportunities which rural seclusion offers for quiet contemplation appears in his poem *Retirement*, and in his *Farewell Hymne to the Country* he shows himself to be at one and the same time a devotee of the countryside and of Spenser. His tastes in literature were eclectic and ranged from the Greek tragedians to Chaucer, but he found especial pleasure in Dyer, Thomson, Shenstone, and Gray. That he had a strongly emotional side to his nature is evident from his liking for Pope's *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady* and *Eloisa to Abelard* in preference to his satires and translations. They seemed to him replete with poetical fire and struck his imagination with a captivating horror, and he claimed that no one endued with a true relish of poetry could ever grow weary of reading them.¹ Similarly, in Prior's *Henry and Emma*, condemned by Johnson as "a dull and tedious dialogue, which excites neither esteem for the man nor tenderness for the woman,"² Potter discovered cause for tears.³ Akin to this outburst of sentiment is the love of melancholy, which derived such pleasure from Pomfret's lines :

The sweetest music to the grove we owe,
Is mournful Philomel's melodious woe.⁴

In the choice of his verse forms Potter showed the same catholicity. He was strongly opposed to the predominance of the heroic couplet, and though he used it himself at first, he later acquired skill in other modes of poetical expression. He upheld blank verse as a medium both for epic and drama. After he had read blank verse, rime sounded to his ear "trifling, tinkling, and childish" and he found it preposterous "to jingle through passion and despair, horrors and death." It was far more appropriate that the larger part of a tragedy should be in prose, and only when the passion grew intense ought it to adopt metrical form, which should be blank verse rather than rime, as being more supple and natural. But since rime lent itself to didactic terseness, it might well be applied to this end.⁵

¹ *The Art of Criticism*, p. 140.

² *The Art of Criticism*, p. 98.

³ *Lives of the Poets*, vol. iii, p. 31.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-7.

From what has already been said, it is evident that Potter was not likely to see eye to eye with Johnson on most literary questions. The full extent of their disagreement, however, can only be understood by studying Potter's *Inquiry into some passages in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the Poets*. There was much that he respected in his great contemporary. Not that he rated Johnson nearly as high as Addison, whom he admired for his refinement and enlightenment, the justice of his opinions, the simplicity and elegance of his style, and the infallibility of his taste. He would never admit that Johnson's achievement as a critic was comparable with that of Addison, who had dispelled the mists of barbarism which hung over learning, and radiated an intellectual light the influence of which was universal and permanent. But he did appreciate Johnson's "vigorous and manly understanding" and maintained that he had been "deservedly distinguished by his great abilities." He recognized, too, the authoritative position which Johnson had won: "The public has so long been habituated to receive and submit to his decisions, that that they are now by many considered as infallible," and while Potter was far from accepting Johnson's verdicts so uncritically, he formed a favourable opinion of him as a biographer from his *Life of Savage*. He perceived how well Johnson had performed a difficult task, drawing a sympathetic portrait of a man whose faults he was "too truthful to suppress, too virtuous to defend," and with a flash of insight Potter declares, "Dr. Johnson has the feelings of humanity warm at his honest heart." So pleasing a work had awakened great expectations when it became known that the *Lives of the Poets* was in preparation. But in spite of "the many just observations, the solid sense, the deep penetration" which these lives displayed, the four volumes contained some passages in which Johnson was open to criticism. Of these, although "with great respect to his understanding and virtues," Potter speaks freely and firmly.

He finds fault, in the first place, with the party spirit which disfigures the *Lives*. It is often disagreeable, but in the account of Milton it is disgusting. However, Potter is far from wishing to defend Milton's political or religious principles: "I know too well the intolerant spirit of that liberty, which worked its odious purposes through injustice, oppression, and cruelty; but it is of little consequence to the present and future ages whether the author of *Paradise Lost* was Papist or Presbyterian, Royalist or Republican;

it is the Poet that claims our attention." For his own part, therefore, Potter considered that Milton's share in contemporary politics was not the business of the literary critic. Still he was prepared to grant that others might think otherwise, though he held that any treatment of the subject ought to imitate the moderation of John Phillips rather than the partisanship of Johnson.¹

Potter also complains of the introduction of what he regards as petty gossip. He regrets that the masculine spirit of Johnson should be so far influenced by the current passion for anecdotes as to indulge in what, to use his own idiom, might be called "anile garrulity." Potter cared nothing for the details in which a Boswell delighted but evidently conceived of biography as a high and stately branch of literature. "In reading the life of any eminent person," he says,

we wish to be informed of the qualities which gave him the superiority over other men: when we are poorly put off with paltry circumstances, which are common to him with common men, we receive neither instruction nor pleasure. We know that the greatest men are subject to the infirmities of human nature equally with the meanest; why then are these infirmities recorded? Can it be of any importance to us to be told how many pairs of stockings the author of the *Essay on Man* wore? Achilles and Thersites eat, and drank, and slept; in these things the Hero was not distinguished from the Buffoon: are we made the wiser or the better by being informed that the translator of Homer stewed his Lampreys in a silver saucepan?

Equally he condemns the feeble joke of a contemporary related by Johnson, that Dyer, the author of *The Fleece*, would be buried in woollen. For Dyer, who combined a love of nature and an intimate knowledge of the classics, Potter evidently felt the sympathy of a kindred spirit and he turns aside for a moment from his main argument to challenge Johnson's estimate of him. Johnson had written that Dyer was not a poet of bulk or dignity sufficient to require an elaborate criticism. To this judgment Potter replies:

Does Dr. Johnson estimate poetical merit, as Rubens did feminine beauty, *by the stone*? Well then might he recommend Blackmore to us. If *The Fleece* be now universally neglected, let me join my testimony

¹ Most likely Potter is alluding to the life of Milton prefixed to the *Letters of State*, written by Mr John Milton, London, 1694. Its author was Edward Phillips (cf. *The Early Lives of Milton*, ed. Helen Darbishire, London, 1932, p. 340). John Phillips also wrote a life of Milton, as Miss Darbishire, *op. cit.*, p. xvi *et seq.*, has shown, but it remained in manuscript among Anthony à Wood's papers in the Bodleian Library until published in *The Early Lives of Milton*, pp. 17-34.

to that of Akinside, that such neglect is a reproach to the reigning taste; the poem is truly classical: to say that "Dyer's mind was not unpoetical," is parsimonious praise; he had a benevolent heart, a vigorous imagination, and a chastised judgment; his style is compact and nervous; his numbers have harmony, spirit, and force.

In a few instances Potter claimed that Johnson had cast unjustifiable aspersions on those mentioned in the *Lives*. His opinion of the gentle manners and kindly disposition of Addison was so high that he revolted at Johnson's account of his avidity and especially of his harshness in reclaiming a loan from Steele by means of an execution. Potter asserts on the best authority that it is an absolute falsehood, though as he does not mention his authority, such a statement can carry little weight. Again, Potter maintains that Johnson's remarks on the lady who is the subject of Hammond's elegies are cruel: "An old Goth would not have been guilty of such an indelicacy."

Potter is therefore by no means willing to accept meekly all the views of Johnson, "who has so long dictated to the public taste, and that in a pretty high tone." The resentment here clearly expressed is all the stronger, because Potter is keenly aware that taste is changing and that there are domains in which even one so eminent as Johnson cannot claim to be an arbiter. One of these is landscape gardening, which had become so fashionable and in which Potter himself evidently took a lively interest. In writing on Shenstone, Johnson had doubted whether these activities demand any great powers of mind and had suggested that "perhaps a sullen and surly speculator may think such performances rather the sport than the business of human reason." To which Potter replies: "Whatever 'a sullen and surly speculator may think,' the true judge of beautiful nature will esteem it an elegant exertion of real genius." It was evidently the common bond between him and Shenstone which led him to rebut the "tasteless ridicule" of one whose predilection he shared. With equal warmth he rejects Johnson's suggestion that Lord Lyttelton had displayed a petty jealousy of Shenstone's experiments in gardening and rebukes him severely for circulating so cruel and unjust a reflection when "from the most honourable authority, which he ought to have respected,"¹ he had received an assurance of its falsity.

Such detraction, Potter contends, is widespread in the *Lives*.

¹ Conceivably Potter alludes to Mrs. Montagu.

Few go scot-free, for if the man escapes the poet is condemned. He therefore holds that Johnson should have bridled his censorious spirit and attempted instead to show how much or how little the various poets contributed to the general stock, "to have ascertained . . . the various powers, the peculiar vein, the naïveté of each poet." This he did in the *Life of Cowley*, but not elsewhere. Still Potter would not have had entire confidence in Johnson, even if he had pursued this course. It was a mystery to him how any man of taste could recommend the introduction into the *Lives* of such small fry as Pomfret, Yalden, Watts, and, worst of all, Blackmore. He derides the "sagacious and penetrating Critic," who "has the peculiar felicity of discovering that Blackmore 'finds the art of uniting ornament with strength, and ease with closeness'" and ridicules the opinion that "this is a skill which Pope might have condescended to learn from him, when he needed it so much in his *Moral Essays*." All which seems to Potter so absurd that he quotes the following epigram¹:

Yon Ass in vain the flow'ry lawns invite;
To mumble thistles his supreme delight.
Such is the Critic, who with wayward pride
To Blackmore gives the praise to Pope denied;
Wakes Yalden's embers, joys in Pomfret's lay,
But sickens at the heav'n-strung lyre of Gray.

It is with Johnson as a critic of lyric poetry that Potter chiefly occupies himself. He takes as his starting-point an account of early lyric poetry in *The Rambler*² and dismisses it as unscholarly. Having proved to his own satisfaction how misguided was Johnson's conception of the lyric and expressed his disagreement with the praise bestowed on Dryden's poem on the death of Mrs. Killigrew, he pays a warm tribute to Collins as being the first English poet to achieve great excellence in the ode:

His faculties were vigorous, and his genius truly sublime; his style is close and strong, and his numbers in general harmonious. He was well acquainted with Æschylus and Euripides, and drew deep from their fountains: his thoughts had a romantic cast, and his imagination a certain wild grandeur, which sometimes perhaps approaches to the borders of extravagance; but this led him to descriptions and allegories wonderfully poetical.

¹ Potter does not give the author's name. The contents indicate that he may well have written it himself.

² No. 158.

Consequently, Potter asserts that Johnson was wrong in disapproving of his allegorical imagery and unjust in criticizing his harmony, but he praises the tenderness with which Johnson spoke of Collins and the insight which he displayed in allowing that, sometimes at least, he possessed sublimity and splendour.

The rest of Potter's pamphlet is devoted to Johnson's remarks on Gray. It is evident that he felt keenly the cavilling spirit in which Johnson had approached his subject. In some degree he attributed this to sheer discourtesy, and perhaps he was all the more disposed to take this view, because of his own experience at the hands of the dictator. "There is in some persons," he says, "a blunt and surly humour, which prides itself in despising these laws of civility; and often with an awkward affection of pleasantry they play their rude gambols to make mirth."¹ If anyone, however, had a claim to be exempted from such "pelting petulance," it was Gray:

His own polished manners restrained him from ever giving offence to any good man, his warm and chearful benevolence endeared him to all his friends; though he lived long in a college he lived not *sullenly*² there, but in a liberal intercourse with the wisest and most virtuous men of his time; he was perhaps the most learned man of the age, but his mind never contracted the rust of pedantry; he had too good an understanding to neglect that urbanity which renders society pleasing; his conversation was instructing, elegant, and agreeable; superior knowledge, an exquisite taste in the fine arts, and above all purity of morals and an unaffected reverence for religion made this excellent person an ornament to society and an honour to human nature.

This recollection, as Potter calls it, suggests that Gray and he, both of them Cambridge men, had met on some occasion, which seems all the more possible, as Potter's *Inquiry* contained a portrait of Gray, engraved from an original drawing in the author's possession. The predilections of a friend could find little encouragement in Johnson's *Life* for the view that Gray shone in lyric poetry with peculiar lustre. With all his energy therefore Potter set himself to demonstrate the distinction of Gray as a writer of odes. His extensive reading furnished him with a good stock of arguments. Now and then his familiarity with Johnson's writings neatly turned the tables on his opponent. Thus, when objection is taken to "Idalia's velvet-green" in *The Progress of Poesy* on the ground that "an epithet or metaphor drawn from Nature ennobles Art;

¹ Cf. *An Inquiry into some passages in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the Poets*, pp. 33-4.

² An allusion to Johnson's "sullen and surly speculator" (*vid. ante*, p. 311).

an epithet or metaphor drawn from Art degrades Nature," Potter answers :

On this head Dr. Johnson will perhaps pay some deference to the authority of the learned Critic, who, comparing the style of Dryden with that of Pope, says that Pope's style " is a *velvet lawn*, shaven by the scythe, and levelled by the roller."

Again, when Johnson criticizes the use of alliteration in *The Bard*, Potter quotes instances from *The Vanity of Human Wishes* and the Prologue to *Irene*. Above all, however, Potter measured Gray's achievements by comparing his work with Greek literature. He praises the *Ode on Spring* as being " in the brightest manner of Pindar," *The Progress of Poesy* too is a happy imitation of the Pindaric manner, and the opening of the *Hymn to Adversity* is in the true spirit of Æschylus. When Johnson says of Dryden's car that it " has nothing in it peculiar ; it is a car in which any other rider may be placed," he is informed that he would have shown more judgment, if he had pointed out its Pindaric imagery, and when the stanzas of *The Bard* are blamed for their length, Johnson is reminded that Pindar has many longer.

Against Johnson's verdict Potter now and then appeals to older tradition. If Johnson criticizes Gray's phrase " buxom health " in the *Ode on a distant prospect of Eton College*, it is recalled that Milton uses the epithet twice and when a similar dislike of " the honied spring " is expressed, Potter quotes the authority of Milton and Shakespeare and traces a parallel in the Latin " mellitus." Sometimes more substantial questions are involved. Johnson ridicules Gray's supplication to Father Thames to tell him who drives the hoop or tosses the ball as useless and puerile. " Father Thames has no better means of knowing than himself." Potter, who in his own verse had frequent recourse to " such impersonations and addresses to woods, mountains and streams," argues that they lend to poetry a peculiar animation and having cited passages from Vergil and Milton, decides to " leave the free people of Parnassus their antient right of addressing the kings of the floods, and other poetical sovereigns." Again, Johnson has no mercy on the second stanza of *The Progress of Poesy*, but derisively says : " Criticism disdains to chase a school-boy to his common places." This leads Potter to a short disquisition on the suitability of using ancient mythology. When it

is introduced into times, and manners, and subjects, to which it has no relation, it is puerile and justly reprehensible ; but there are occasions

and circumstances which seem to require its use; and in these to deny it a place is unreasonable prejudice, particularly as it abounds with poetical images, of which we have two fine instances in this Stanza.

Of the sixth stanza in the same ode Johnson has said that it "sounds big . . . but in all Gray's Odes there is a kind of cumbrous splendor which we wish away." Such allusions to places and persons, Potter contends, are a feature of the classical tradition and he quotes instances from Vergil, Milton, and in the same breath, "the Bard Mason"! Such beauties "were universally admired, till in good time Dr. Johnson arose to correct the public taste. Yet, before we extinguish this splendor, cumbrous as it may be deemed, let me presume to suggest to his consideration that it is of the essence of Poetry to give locality to persons and things."

On the other hand, Johnson was sometimes apt to be limited by classical reminiscences, when Potter, with his romantic leanings, was able to demand for the poets of his age a greater freedom. This is best seen in connection with *The Bard*. Johnson blamed Gray for making the slaughtered bards weave the winding sheet, but Potter refuses to admit that this was outrageous and incongruous merely because in another mythology the thread of life was spun by female hands. Similarly, when Johnson condemns the introduction of the marvellous and the puerilities of obsolete mythology in *The Bard*, Potter retorts in a notable passage:

The misfortune is, this Critic is for regulating poetic imagination by the standard of methodical argumentation and philosophical truth; as if the excursions of Shakespear's fancy were to be measured by the theorems of Euclid. Fiction is the province of this kind of poetry, which delights in the marvellous that barely comes within the verge of possibility: it has an ideal world of its own peopled with imaginary beings, and builds its agreeable delusions on the light foundations of fancy, popular belief, old traditions, and vulgar superstitions.

It was on these principles, he argues, that the ancients allowed the mythological fictions of their poets, though no more credible to them than later superstitions to the men of Johnson's day. In all ages popular belief has been taken as the foundation of poetic fiction and in support of this view Potter adduces the evidence of Beattie's *Essay on Poetry*. To clinch his argument he gives an extract from Ossian, of whom he was evidently a great admirer¹ and exclaims:

¹ A previous allusion to him in the *Inquiry*, p. 26, shows that Potter regarded the authorship of the Ossianic poems as uncertain.

Wretched as the mythology in Ossian's Poems is, attention recoils not from the delirious fancy, but we feel ourselves impressed with the ideas of the Northern Bard, and even catch his enthusiasm: I envy not the heart that can turn, with an incredulus odi, from images like this.

For the rest, he refers to the treatment of this subject, particularly as it relates to Gothic and Celtic superstitions, by "the two best Critics of this or any other age," Bishop Hurd and Mrs. Montagu,¹ and expresses his astonishment that any one who had read the *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* and the discourse on præternatural beings in *The Genius and Writings of Shakespear* could speak with contempt of the marvellous element in *The Bard*.

In the main, Potter confines himself to the detailed examination of the strictures passed by Johnson on Gray's odes, but incidentally he gives his own estimate of these poems. In the *Ode on the Spring* he admired the elegance of composition, the harmony of numbers, the richness of fancy and glow of colour. He admitted that the ideas, considered separately, might not be original, but Gray's skill in selecting, arranging and adorning his images had given them all the grace of novelty. In his observations on the *Ode on a distant prospect of Eton College* Potter is somewhat vague, for he talks only of its glow of rapture and the most enchanting strains of poetry which it contains. It would seem that the *Hymn to Adversity* appealed to him more strongly, for he finds in it true sublimity, grandeur of imagery, dignity of expression, and sober harmony. *The Progress of Poesy* showed, in Potter's opinion, that Gray was equally master of those airs which "lap the land in ecstasy" and of the dreadful harmony which appals the soul; its richness of imagination, felicity of expression, and sweetness of numbers gave it a claim to rank high in lyric poetry. However, the ode which above all others awakened his delight was *The Bard*. He was infected with the same enthusiasm as Beattie, whose remarks he quotes with approval, and sums up his own attitude to the poem in these terms: "The wild and romantic scenery, the strength of conception, the boldness of the figures, the terrible sublimity, the solemn spirit of prophecy, and the animated glow of visions of glory render this 'the finest Ode in the world.'"

It is obvious that Potter was prepared to accord to Gray a commanding position among the poets. The purity of his diction, the compactness and nervous strength of his language all seemed to him to warrant such eminence. Not least, the invariable appro-

¹ On p. 31 of the *Inquiry* he refers to her again as "a fine writer."

priateness of his manner pointed to his unfailing artistic instinct. When the subject "is gay and smiling, his diction is elegant and glittering; in the sober reflections of saintly melancholy it is grave and solemn; and it rises with an elevated dignity along with the boldest flights of his sublime imagination." Gifted with a delicate and sensitive ear, he was able to modulate his verse in exquisite variations, all blending into a rich and copious harmony. The final verdict therefore must be that

Gray inherited the ample pinion of the Theban Eagle, and sails with supreme dominion through the azure deep of air; but he never sinks to that humiliating lowness to which not want of genius, but the poverty of his subject often depresses the Theban's fluttering pennons: he therefore has a claim to the highest rank in the realms of Lyric Poetry.

Warming to his theme, Potter now gives vent in less measured terms than at the beginning to the indignation which he felt at the attack of Johnson on Gray "with such outrage and indecency." He can account for it only by a complete lack of sympathy on the part of the critic and by his singular deficiency in poetic sensibility. Potter concludes by expressing the hope that his remarks "may be a lesson to literary tyrants to bear their faculties meekly, to favour the Progress to Poesy, and to spare the Bard."¹

In 1789 there appeared Potter's second literary pamphlet, *The Art of Criticism; as exemplified in Dr. Johnson's Lives of the most eminent English Poets*. It was more extensive in scope than its predecessor, for it examined other lives than those previously discussed and, Johnson now being dead, Potter was more frank and less respectful. He was still of opinion that the *Life of Savage* was the best, since it was written at an earlier period than the rest and hence "less quaint, atrabilious, conceited, and wayward."² It also seemed to him less hastily planned than the later *Lives*, which created an impression of confusion, owing to the mingling

¹ In later years Potter thought that some of Johnson's strictures on Gray were not without foundation, "particularly that his language is encumbered and harsh; and that his poetry was in a manner the effect of industry and perseverance. The *Bard* in particular is too artificial as opposed to natural; involved in complications of figures, forced with tautologies, distorted by inversions, and diajoined by parentheses and full points; and, to carry on the metaphor, raised or roughened with fretwork into false, or at least not true, sublime. The *Progress of Poetry* . . . and even his slighter pieces have likewise a stiffness to which Pindar had certainly no recourse, and from which Dryden's ode is entirely exempt. Gray owes much to scowering." (Cf. *The Art of Criticism*, p. 184.)

² *The Art of Criticism*, p. 122.

of incidental criticism with the biography. They would have been more satisfactory, he maintained, if the literary comment had been kept entirely apart. He thought well of Johnson's account of Watts and Warburton, and eulogized his observations on Pope's conduct to Cibber and his comparison of Pope with Dryden, but he accused him of parading his Jacobitism and of being swayed by Tory prejudice in his attitude to Halifax and Ambrose Philips. Potter resented the cruelty and savageness which Johnson exhibited to some writers, but readily admitted his tenderness to others. However, where he felt that Johnson's chief weakness lay, was in the limitation of his outlook. His mind was, said Potter, "in some respects, as narrow as a crane's neck."¹ He had no relish for anything but the didactic, and so love poetry was beyond his comprehension. For the understanding of pastoral poetry Johnson suffered from a still graver disability in Potter's eyes, because of his urban predilections. When the critic dismissed Gay's *Dione* contemptuously with the remark that "Such scenes please Barbarians in the dawn of literature, and children in the dawn of life; but will be for the most part thrown away, as men grow wise, and nations grow learned,"² the indignant Potter retorted "Perhaps he who prefers the world as it is man's, to it as it is God's, is rather a barbarian."³ In another passage Potter declares that if Johnson had ever thought that the Golden Age would return, he would have prayed fervently to be delivered from it: "How insipid and wretched must he have deemed the condition of Adam and Eve before their fall, when neither taverns, venison, nor slander, were in being!"⁴ But the most elaborate defence of rural themes and of the pastoral form in particular arises out of Johnson's comments on Shenstone. "The Doctor, as always," says Potter,

sickens at the idea of any thing rural. Were it not vain to argue against a person who possessed but three out of the five senses, being destitute of that of taste and sight, one might have asked him who wrote *London*, whether great cities do not afford something sickening, distressing, or horrible, at every step by day or by night. Too true it is, that the savageness of mankind renders rural, as well as other scenes, often sickening and odious; but the scenes of pastoral may be supposed to be laid in Arcadia, or rather indeed in fancied Arcadia. But if we will not in this admit fiction allowed to every kind of poetry, but insist on truth, ancient, or perhaps some modern, realities may afford some satisfaction. It may

¹ *The Art of Criticism*, p. 109.

² *The Art of Criticism*, p. 108.

³ *Lives of the Poets*, vol. iii, p. 139.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 110-11.

not be impossible, that as the belief of the true God has always been preserved in some corner of the world, so the genuine simplicity of nature may have never been quite extinct. But otherwise, the pastoral poet may revert to the state of man before the fall. At all times grazing flocks are certainly a pleasing sight: though, in modern times, those who deem themselves of the better sort, annex, like the lowest of mankind whom they nevertheless despise, no idea of entertainment to the prospect of them, but sordidness: they, I will not say, like our biographer, have not the least relish of nature as it is solely God's. If, according to a remark of Pope's, in his essay on pastoral, only the pleasing objects of rural life should be presented to view, that of a shepherd in Britain at this day has agreeable circumstances. Let one figure to himself a fine spring morning; the sun rising over a distant hill, bespangling the wide surrounding lawn with pearl, the harmless smiling flocks cropping it, and the lark singing over his head, whilst perhaps the thought¹ of his fair one attunes his own voice to the carrol and the song. If moreover he has a genius for verse, or music to entertain his long leisure, the comparison with sequestered scenes of Arcadia will not seem preposterous. But withal, the reader of pastoral, as of romance, may please himself with the natural congenial idea of a future immortal state, realizing, and more than realizing, the sweet tranquil descriptions of Arcadian and Elysian vales, or of golden castles and ivory gates turning to angelic harmony, such as it never entered the imagination of poet to conceive. Regarding the pastoral of romance, as better than past, as prophetic of what is to come; of, for ought we know, Paradise Regained, when the thoughts of the butcher shall not mingle with the sights of the flocks and herds.²

In spite of everything, Potter was disposed to believe that as a critic Johnson compared favourably with Joseph Warton, for if he had less taste and impartiality, he had more shrewdness and poignancy. But he had no high opinion of Johnson as a poet, for he maintained that one so formal, heavy, and phlegmatic could never attain to great heights in poetry. As for his play *Irene*, Potter observes that although Garrick gave it the advantage of a brilliant production, it had so little action that it fluttered nine nights and then died. Moreover, this failure was but just, for the representation of tortures, so excruciating and shocking to behold, does not constitute great tragedy.³ Potter was not impressed by the pompous, sesquipedalian manner of *The Rambler* and asserted that *The Spectator* would always have more readers. Indeed, he even went so far as to say that for all the weightiness of its matter,

¹ Substituted for the misprint "thoughts" in the text.

² *The Art of Criticism*, pp. 173-6.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 22 and 150-1.

in animation and attraction *The Rambler* perhaps fell short of Hawke-worth's *Adventurer*.¹

At the end of his survey Potter summarizes his estimate of Johnson's merits and defects as follows :

The characteristics of Dr. Johnson were general and extensive classical erudition, strong sense, and accurate observation ; which seasoned with dry humour and sly detraction, rather than Dryden's free, and Pope's pungent wit, have rendered his classical erudition equally immortal. Strange, and a pity it was, that with his great qualities, he, or rather his posthumous editors, should make the world the confessor of his weaknesses, and of his methodism, commixed as they were with literary butchery and savageness. Indeed his character consisted of contradictions. Though his piety was great, and he feared not man, but God, nor any dangers of death, yet he trembled at the thoughts of it. His piety was of the kind, that, haughty and arrogant as it was, would have held the world in the fetters of slavery and priestcraft, whilst the precepts inculcated in these *lives* run counter both to divinity and christian morality. He thought that every one but himself should submit to the great, whilst he despised all men but Popes and Kings, and his father among the rest. As his own character was inconsistent, so his countrymen, nine in ten of whom despised his principles, and nine in ten of the remainder his uncouth manner approaching to savageness, though he was enamoured of a smooth luxurious age, adored him. . . .

Of his works ; though they have little of originality, and his style has a certain atrabiliousness, and his tissue of paragraphs an unpleasing quaintness, it must be confessed that his Dictionary, *Rambler*, and the two imitative translations of Juvenal, &c. are very excellent ; and that these *Lives of the English Poets* contain a fund of very valuable general criticism. . . . But the coarseness of his constitution, his vigorous mind being perhaps vitiated or degraded by the grossness of his body, vibrated not to the delicate touches of a Shenstone and a Hammond, nor even to the stronger hand of a Gray, but gravitated by the weight of that in which it was inclosed to earth. Johnson's feelings were more ordinary than fine, which indeed accounts for his popularity ; more nervous than elevated. . . .

Johnson was in literature what the first Pitt was in politics, both being alike rough and overbearing. And it would, methinks, be no disagreeable speculation for a moment, how such violent spirits would have asserted on the national theatre ? . . . Johnson seldom writes to the fancy ; nor visibly ironically so as to discover such a purpose to the reader ; but in a continual jog-trot of didactic, allowing no holiday. He constantly addresses himself to the understanding ; makes no excursions into the regions of spirits, beyond " this visible diurnal sphere," nor essays knowledge denied to " ears of flesh and blood " ; nor even wishes to stray beyond the walks of mere modern life, back to the regions

¹ *The Art of Criticism*, pp. 91, 92 and 106.

of Gothic fancy. His timid, impalpable, dreary religion permitted him not to expatiate in the field of hypothesis and conjecture; reveries, vain, perhaps, yet amusing; the food of the soul, and a refuge from the miseries and calamities of life. Terribly afraid of free-thinking, though not hostile to free-eating, he immersed in dogma and superstition, fearing to make use of reason as a mediator between extremes. He had the anxiety and yearning of the Psalmist without the joy and exultation: such as repel from a pleasant contemplation of the Deity, and instead of imparting delight, make men shrink back from eternity, and exhibit the idea of death terrible; such as pluck away the rose buds of ideal hope from the hour of the separation of soul and body, and point it only with thorns. But these maladies, and his other defects and faults, candour will partially set down to his frame of body, ill adapted to a perfect mind, and acknowledge him, with whose anecdotes the press teemed, to have been no inconsiderable person, but a great author, notwithstanding his Dictionary is imperfect, his Rambler pompous, his Idler inane, his lives unjust, his poetry inconsiderable, his learning common, his ideas vulgar, his Irene a child of mediocrity, his genius and wit moderate, his precepts wor[l]dly, his politics narrow, and his religion bigoted.¹

In *The Art of Criticism* Potter is less effective than in his *Inquiry*, for he is frequently discursive and sometimes repeats himself. In both pamphlets, he is insufficiently concerned with general principles to have any claim to distinction as a critic. Far from making any attempt to arrive at an art of criticism, he concentrates on details and sometimes on trivialities. But his comments are of interest, because they show how this disciple of the ancients was influenced by the contemporary trend towards romanticism and also because they draw attention to some of Johnson's weaknesses. Yet for all his antagonism, which obviously distorts his perspective at times, Potter was manifestly impressed by the powers of Johnson. The giant might have imperfections in his armour which rendered him vulnerable, but a giant he still remained.

¹ *The Art of Criticism*, pp. 189-94.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

REFERENCES TO CHAUCER IN CAMPION'S POEMATATA

MISS SPURGEON, in her *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Allusions*, included Thomas Campion's passage in the preface to the *Fourth Booke of Ayres* where he offers the example of the *Canterbury Tales* as an excuse for indecencies in poetry. It is perhaps worth pointing out that on sig. A2 of the copy of Campion's *Poemata*, 1595, in the Huntington Library at San Marino, California, there is a similar excuse offered for the freedom of his Latin verses. Since the Bodleian copy lacks the first two leaves, these lines have not been generally known to scholars and are here reprinted by permission of the Huntington Library.

Ad Lectorem

Si mihi lasciva est, discinctaque pagina Lector,
Talis Chauceri docta Thalia fuit.
Illum simpliciter nullaque ambage loquentem
Iam tria laudarunt saecula, nulla vetant.
Quis iuveni lusus? quis mascula verba negabit?
Si tantum deceant mollia scripta senem.

Another reference to Chaucer in this volume has been partially overlooked. In 1923 Professor T. S. Graves published in *Studies in Philology*, XX, 470, the first four lines of a passage on Chaucer in *Elegia I*. For the sake of continuity I give the whole passage here. Campion, in introducing his book of elegies, is maintaining that England is dear to Phœbus and offers Chaucer as an example.

Ut taceam musas, toto quas orbe silentes
Chaucerus mira fecerat arte loqui.
Ille Palaemonios varie depixit amores,
Infidamque viro Chressida Dardanio.
Prodigiosa illo dictante canebat arator,
Ludicra, decertans cum molitore faber.
Sic peregrinantum ritus perstringit aniles.
Rivalemque dei devovet usque papam.

Quis deus o vates magnis erepte tenebris
 Admovit capiti lumina tanta tuo ?
 Fabula nec vulgi, nec te Romana fefellit
 Pompa, nec Ausonii picta theatra lupi.

Aside from the inclusion of both Chaucer's serious and comic work, the interesting thing is the specific mention of the spurious Plowman's Tale (*arator*), then accepted as Chaucer's, and consequent praise of Chaucer as an early opponent of the papacy. In this Campion followed the general opinion of his time, but the idea is made more striking by its Latin dress and its position in the introduction to a series of Ovidian elegies.

Both the *Ad Lectorem* and the *Elegia I* were omitted in the 1619 edition. In the case of the longer poem the cause was probably that Campion had become a Catholic. As far as I know, this has not been suggested before. The clue is found in Thomas Farnaby's "Catalogus Poetarum" at the end of his *Index Poeticus*, 1634. After giving long lists of foreign neo-Latin poets, he mentions only seven from England: Joseph of Exeter, Thomas More, William Alabaster, Thomas Campion, William Drury, Robert Turner, and Elizabeth Jane Weston. Of this remarkable list all except Campion are already known to have been Catholics during all or part of their lives. Obviously the same implication was meant as to him. With this in mind, if we turn to Campion's 1619 volume of Latin poems, we find that the only two passages offensive to Catholics in the 1595 volume, *Ad Thamesin* (on defeat of the Armada) and *Elegia I*, are among the poems omitted in revision. The conclusion, therefore, seems very probable that some time between 1595 and 1619 Campion had secretly joined the Roman Church.

LEICESTER BRADNER.

TWO NOTES ON MILTON

I. DID MILTON CHANGE HIS VIEWS AFTER *PARADISE LOST*?

MR. SEWELL¹ holds that there are contradictions between the *De Doctrina Christiana* and *Paradise Lost*, and that Milton changed his views after the publication of his epic.

His two main arguments bear on the death of Christ in his two natures, human and divine; and on supposed traces of Trini-

¹ *Essays and Studies* (English Association), vol. xix. (1934).

tarianism in Bk. III of *Paradise Lost*. Neither argument seems to me valid. Mr. Sewell quotes the Son's speech (III, 245 ff.):

Though now to Death I yield, and am his due
All of me that can die, yet that debt paid
Thou wilt not leave me in the loathsome grave
His prey, nor suffer my unspotted Soule
For ever with corruption there to dwell. . . .

to prove that Milton was then hesitating as to the total death of Christ. But it is sufficient to compare this with Adam's speech (X, 780), to see that Milton meant Death to be complete in both cases, since Adam, who has no divine nature, expresses the same sentiments as the Son:

Yet one doubt
Pursues me still, least all I cannot die,
Lest that pure breath of life, the spirit of Man
Which inspired cannot together perish
With this corporeal clod; then in the grave
Or in some other dismal place, who knows
But I shall die, a living death? O thought
Horrid if true! Yet why? it was but breath
Of Life that sinned; what dies but what had life
And sin? the Body properly hath neither
All of me then shall die.

These are the Mortalists' arguments as found in the 1655 pamphlet on *Man's Mortalitie*.

The "soul" dies with the body; the word "soul" for Milton means "breath of life." The Son uses the converse argument: his soul—his life—is unspotted, and therefore shall not die; just as Adam's breath of life is now sinful and therefore shall die.

The doctrine in the poem and in the treatise is the same. The study of the handwriting of the MSS., which Mr. Sewell sets great store by, can here prove nothing.

As for the second argument, derived mainly from the text

Hail, holy light, etc.

it proves nothing either of what Mr. Sewell wants to prove. Mr. Sewell stops his quotation at the sixth line. But Milton goes on; after:

Bright effluence of bright essence increate,

he writes:

Or hear'st thou rather pure Ethereal Stream
Whose fountain who shall tell?

and gives his second alternative: either Light is co-eternal with God, or it is a stream which comes from God. Milton does not

here wish to decide the point ; it is a problem which he considers too high for him to solve. The passage does not in any way make Milton a Trinitarian. The Third Person does not come into it at all ; and if we identify Light with the Son as the Second Person, the *bright effluence* is inferior to the *bright essence* metaphysically, even if it is co-eternal with it.

II. LIGHT AND THE SON

Mr. Maurice Kelley, in the *Times Literary Supplement*, September 6, 1934, refuses the identification with the Son, though bringing forward good evidence from the *Treatise of Christian Doctrine* (Bohn IV, 145) against co-equality with the Father even when the expression "equal to God" is used. The identification of the Son with Light cannot be proved either from *Paradise Lost* or from the *T.C.D.*, it is true ; but identification of the Son with the primitive divine matter from which the world is made ("One first matter all"), can be, from both texts. The ancient tradition that Light was the first divine matter was too well established not to have been in Milton's mind ; and the idea is fully developed in the *Mortalitie* pamphlets which stand in close relationship to Milton. Milton, it seems to me, did not wish to be dogmatic on such abstruse matters ; even as he did not wish to be dogmatic on the Ptolemaic or Copernican systems : it made little difference really to his own thorough-going materialism and he was willing to let the reader have it either way.

Bk. III., 383 :

Thee next they sang of all Creation first
Begotten Son, Divine Similitude,

settles the point that the Son is inferior to the Father, even in Bk. III.

In short, both Mr. Sewell and Mr. Kelley seem to me not to bear sufficiently in mind Milton's general ideas, as expressed in many passages, when discussing this or that particular passage. A single expression, like "equal to God," may be misleading unless brought into relation with a broader principle. But I agree with Mr. Kelley's judgment that "Mr. Sewell's hypothesis seems, to me at least, hardly acceptable."

DENIS SAURAT.

HENRY KILLIGREW AND THE DUKE OF
BUCKINGHAM

THE story of the quarrel that took place between Henry Killigrew, son of Thomas the dramatist by his first wife Cecilia, and George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, has long been known and included in the biographies of both men.¹ The story in brief is this. On Saturday, July 20, 1667, the duke and Killigrew were both at the theatre; Killigrew, in a box near the duke's, "drolled with him and made fun at him, and spake scurvy language to him,"² and the duke reprimanded him. Killigrew asked a certain Vaughan to carry his challenge to the duke, but Vaughan refused, and Killigrew left his box "and stroke the Duke twice on the head with his sword in the scabbard, and then ran away most nobly over the boxes and forms, and the Duke after him, and cut him well favouredly, he crying, 'Good, your Grace, spare my life,' and fell down, some say to beg for his life, but certainly the Duke kicked him. The Duke lost his wig in the pursuit for a while."³ Killigrew, although ordered to the Tower, was allowed to remain at home when it appeared that he had suffered a severe wound on the head. Of his own accord he decided to leave the country, and Pepys mentions his return from France under the date May 30, 1668.⁴ His departure must have come after August 9, when Charles ordered, apparently for the second time, that he be put into the Tower and that he should be banished from court.⁵ Not until two years later did he effect a reconciliation with the injured duke and kiss the king's hand as a token that he was pardoned.⁶ Popular sympathy in the affair was with the duke, and Killigrew was considered to have got what he deserved.⁷

There is in the British Museum a letter,⁸ dated July 27 [1667],

¹ The sources are as follows: *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. H. B. Wheatley (1918), vii. 31; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of S. H. Le Fleming* (1890), pp. 51-52, 66; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Seventh Report* (1879), p. 486. See also Winifred, Lady Burghclere, *George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham* (1903), pp. 191-92; and Alfred Harbage, *Thomas Killigrew* (Philadelphia, 1930), pp. 126-27.

² H.M.C., *Seventh Report*, p. 486. The quotation is from a letter from Dr. William Denton to Sir Richard Verney, dated July 25.

³ *Ibid.* (This is the most vivid source account of the affair.)

⁴ *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, viii. 32.

⁵ H.M.C., *The Manuscripts of S. H. Le Fleming*, pp. 51-52.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 66. The information comes from a newsletter dated September 14, 1669; but the incident itself is dated September 10.

⁷ See particularly *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, vii. 31.

⁸ MS. Harl 7005, f. 56.

from the Countess Dowager of Roscommon¹ to Mrs. Frances Frescheville of Staveley, Derbyshire.² Although hitherto unnoticed, it furnishes both additional and corroboratory details about the quarrel between Killigrew and Buckingham :

July the 27th

Deare Ma= I am horribly ashamed I writ not sooner, but in good earnest I haue not beene very well, and I may iustifie my beeing not well haueing lost so good a Neighbour ; my hope is y^e you will not onely come at Mich= but come to y^e sam [*sic*] place againe, or at least into y^{ese} feilds, heere was a great bussle the other day at y^e Play-house y^e Duke of Buck= came $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ brought with him his owne lady ; $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ my lady of Shrews= ³ M^r Killigrew satt in a Boxe neere him, $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ as y^e story goes made mouths at y^e Duke, it grew to a quarrele, y^e [*sic*] leapt out of y^e boxes wth drawne swords, y^e Play was disturbed all [leaf one, *verso*] all people cryed haue a care of y^e Duke, y^e danger was not great to him, if the Story bee truly told ; for y^e Souldiers had taken, or M^r Killigrew had lost his sword. so I leaue y^m, $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ come to y^e ladies whos case was I thinke y^e saddest, for y^e poore Duchess s[w]ounded $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ my La= Shrew= was hugely frighted $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ shee is ⁴ wth child. I know not whether y^e Duke bee hurt at all or no, if it bee it is very slightly, M^r Ki= has they say two or =3= hurts in his head but none of danger, hee is hugely blamed $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ y^e Duke iustified to haue caried himselfe as became a man of honour. this bee [leaf two, *recto*] beeing my first letter, I had not neede make it too long, for feare I make y^a afraid of euer seeing more from y^e same hand, $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ that I would not doe, for in earnest I am very ambitious to heare from y^u, beeing with great cordiallness $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ reality,

Madame

Y^r very affec= freind and S
E: ROSCOMON

[leaf two, *verso*] Wee haue done something at Sea they say wee hau[e] burnt [?] some of y^e Dutch ffire Ships but they say for certaine wee shall

¹ Née Elizabeth Wentworth, she was the younger sister of the Earl of Strafford, wife of James, third earl of Roscommon, who died in 1649 ; and mother to the fourth earl, the author of the *Essay on Translated Verse*. See *The Review of English Studies*, ix. (1933), pp. 449-51, for some further information about the countess.

² She was the youngest of the three daughters of Lord John Frescheville by his second wife. Born in 1638 (and consequently considerably younger than the countess), she married a Thomas Culpeper, and died December 3, 1698. See the *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*, iv. 218.

³ Anna Maria Brudenell, daughter of the second Earl of Cardigan, who had already been for some time mistress of Buckingham. On January 17, 1668, he was to kill her husband the earl in a duel (see *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, vii. 265-66). That he took his mistress and his wife to the play together is not surprising ; Pepys records under May 15, 1668 (*ibid.*, viii. 17), that the duke brought the countess to his home to live, coolly inviting the duchess, when she protested, to leave.

⁴ was has been crossed out in the manuscript and *is* substituted.

haue peace.¹ S^r Seymour Shirley² they say is dead of y^e small Poxe, his lady is thought to bee breeding. it is said my Lrd Wotton shall marry my La= Di= Russell,³ but how true y^{as} is I know not. My La : Su= Lott⁴ has a daughter pert yet, God keepe it so.

The presence of Lady Shrewsbury in the box, as told in the letter, supplies a motive for Killigrew's behaviour. He himself, it appears, had once been a lover of the countess, and one may assume that when he saw her with the duke his jealousy or his spite got the better of him. Later, as Pepys records under the date May 19, 1669, the countess had him beaten on his way home at night "upon an old grudge of his saying openly that he had lain with her."⁵ It is of interest to see how Lady Roscommon agrees with the other witnesses in the details of the quarrel, although she alone tells of the presence of the ladies at the theatre. One is inclined to trust her, too, since her account not only tallies with the others but is itself fair and seemingly written without prejudice.

CARL NIEMEYER.

THE SOURCE OF RAVENSCROFT'S *THE ANATOMIST*

IN 1697 was published Edward Ravenscroft's three-act farce. The title-page reads :

The Anatomist : or, The Sham Doctor. Written by Mr. *Ravenscroft*. With *The Loves of Mars and Venus.* A Play Set to Music. Written by Mr. *Motteux*. As they are Acted together at the New Theatre, in *Little Lincolns-Inn-Fields*. London, Printed, and are to be Sold by *R. Baldwin*, near the *Oxford Arms* in *Warwick lane*. 1697.

¹ By the time Lady Roscommon wrote, peace had already been signed at Breda, on July 21.

² Sir Seymour Shirley died on July 16, 1667, the year after his marriage to the daughter of the Earl of Ailesbury. The rumour about his wife passed on by Lady Roscommon was quite correct. The following January she gave birth to a son, who died March 11, 1669 (E. P. Shirley, *Stemmata Shirleiana ; Or the Annals of the Shirley Family* [1873], pp. 161-62).

³ Lady Roscommon was misinformed. Lady Diana Russell, daughter of William, fifth earl and first duke of Bedford, married Sir Greville Verney on August 1, 1667. She was, incidentally, a granddaughter to Robert Carr and the Countess of Essex (J. H. Wiffen, *Historical Memoirs of the House of Russell* [1833], ii. 224).

⁴ Lady Roscommon may refer to Lady Susanna Lort, whose daughter Elizabeth was born in 1666. See G. E. C[okayne], *Complete Baronetage*, iii. (1903), p. 251.

⁵ *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, viii. 307.

So far as I have been able to discover, no specific source for this Ravenscroft play has hitherto been pointed out. As late as 1933 Mr. Allardyce Nicoll said, "... *The Anatomist* plainly shows its indebtedness to Molière."¹ He did not, however, mention any particular play of Molière in this connection and, as we shall see, even the general ascription to Molière merits reconsideration. Having accidentally come upon a summary² of part of the *Crispin Médecin* of Noël le Breton, Sieur de Hauteroche, and having recognized the similarity to Ravenscroft's play, I was led to compare the two in order to define their relationship. Later I found that in an essay entitled "A Player-Friend of Hogarth",³ W. J. Lawrence quotes an account written by Luigi Riccoboni of the two-act version of *The Anatomist* which he saw acted in 1722. Riccoboni's account runs as follows:

At the Theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields I happened to be at the acting of a comedy the principle plot of which I was a stranger to, but with ease could understand an episode which the author without doubt had placed in the intrigue; it is that scene which we have so often seen in the *Crispin Médecin*. The sole alteration that is made therein is the introducing an old man in the Place of a Footman, who by his bustle excites the laughter of the audience, while he places himself in the room of a dead body which the physician is to dissect. The scene was thus disposed ...⁴

The curious thing about this comparison is the fact that Riccoboni ignores the earlier situation in which Crispin, the "Footman," is put on the operating table, etc., exactly as in the French play. Obviously it is Jemmy Spiller's performance of the part of Old Gerald, discussed at length in his next paragraph, which called forth Riccoboni's incidental comparison of the two plays. Since no systematic study of the relationship between the two plays appears ever to have been made, and since the mere fact of their relationship seems generally unknown, some study of this kind is called for.

It will be seen from the following comparison of the *dramatis personæ* that Ravenscroft carried over into his play all of the French characters and some of the names.

¹ *British Drama*, revised ed., New York, 1933, p. 249.

² In *Le Légataire Universel* by Regnard, ed. O. H. Fynes-Clinton (Modern Language Texts), London, 1927, pp. xviii-xix.

³ In *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies* (Second Series), Shakespeare Head Press, 1913.

⁴ Quoted by W. J. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

*Crispin Médecin*¹

Lisidor, Pere de Géralde
 Géralde, Amant d'Alcine
 Mirobolan, Médecin, Pere d'Alcine
 Féliante, Mere d'Alcine
 Alcine
 Dorine, Servante de Féliante
 Marin, Valet de Lisidor
 Crispin, Valet de Géralde

Lise, Servante
 Un Chirurgien

Grand-Simon, Magister de son
 Village.

Anatomist

Old Mr. Gerald
 Young Mr. Gerald
 The Doctor
 Wife to the Doctor
 Mrs. Angelica, their Daughter
 Beatrice, the Maid
 Martin, Servant to Old Gerald
 Crispin, the Sham Doctor, Servant
 to Young Gerald
 Waiting-woman
 (Appears in the play, but not in the
 cast)
 Symon, a Country fellow

Both plays are three acts in length. Except for some slight additions (at the beginning and end of Act I. and at the end of Act II.) occasioned by the musical entertainment sandwiched into the English play, Ravenscroft's first two acts are, practically speaking, a scene for scene and line for line translation of the French. The plot details are identical, including the sequence in which they appear. Lisidor (Old Gerald), having sent his son to the university to get him out of the way, plans to marry the doctor's daughter Alcine (Angelica); he discusses his matrimonial project with his disapproving servant Marin (Martin). The doctor has promised his daughter to Lisidor,² but his wife, who henpecks him unmercifully, refuses her consent because of Lisidor's advanced age. In both plays Crispin is sent with a letter to ask his master's father for money, a letter which he loses and replaces with another. And in both plays the young Gerald is not at the university, where he is supposed to be, but in town, secretly arranging a meeting with the young lady his father is planning to marry. The second act of the two plays begins with the doctor giving orders to the servant Dorine (Beatrice) for the disposal of a body that is to be sent him from the gallows for dissection. After the doctor leaves, Crispin enters. The knocking

¹ References throughout are made to the play as it appears in vol. 2 of the 3-vol. *Théâtre de Hauteroche*, Paris, 1772. *Crispin Médecin* was first staged in 1674; printed 1680 (see *Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Tome Ixix., Paris 1914, p. 358).

² Ravenscroft here adds 20 short speeches in which the Doctor, before Old Gerald can say he has come to speak of Angelica, inquires about his supposed patient's pulse, appetite, etc.—a scene much like part of Molière's *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, i. viii. Ravenscroft had already made use of this Molière scene in his *Citizen turn'd Gentleman* (1672), iii. i.

which signifies the doctor's unexpected return causes Dorine to put Crispin on the operating table where the cadaver was supposed to be; then follows the scene ¹ in which the terrified Crispin narrowly escapes dissection. Two scenes follow in both plays in which Crispin, preferring to play doctor rather than corpse, prescribes pills, first to Lise (Waiting-woman) for the recovery of a lost dog and then to Grand-Simon (Simon), who is seeking to find out whether he is beloved. When the doctor returns again, he button-holes Crispin, still wearing the professional gown, about a difficult case. Both Crispins squirm under the barrage of medical lingo, evade the doctor's questions as long as possible, then finally rush off for the same physical reason.

Ravenscroft's third act differs materially from the third act of *Crispin Médecin*, but most if not all of it can be accounted for without going beyond Hauteroche's play. The opening scene in which Old Gerald bribes the tricky Beatrice to use her influence with Angelica seems to be Ravenscroft's own, but he apparently found the hint for it in *Crispin Médecin* III. v-vi. The following correspondence in the conclusions of the two scenes gives this assumption some factual basis:

Dorine. Ce bon-homme est-il fou,
de prétendre épouser une fille de
dix-huit ans? Il faut avouer
que, quand la Vieillesse se met
l'amour en tête, elle fait cent fois
plus d'extravagances que la Jeu-
nesse. (III. vi.)

Beatrice. . . . What would this
old, stinking, fumbling fool, do
with a sweet young Wife? When
once love gets into an old man's
head, it teaches him as many
tricks, as a dancing Dog. (III.
p. 29.)

The next two scenes are taken directly from the French: Young Gerald sends the reluctant Crispin back to the doctor's house (as in *Crispin Médecin*, III. i.-ii.); and Old Gerald questions Crispin about his master, with the addition of a fight between Crispin and Martin (as in III. iii.-iv.). Old Gerald's calling on Angelica and giving her jewels has no counterpart in the French, though the suggestion for the jewels might come from the first speech in III. viii. The scene in which Old Gerald is forced to "hide" on the operating table while Crispin, feigning to be a doctor, reads over him a lecture on his anatomy, with much brandishing of knives, saws, and other surgical instruments, is an obvious repetition of the similar French

¹ In the plot summary the word *scene* is used in a general sense, without reference to text markings except where so indicated.

scenes from the second act, with Crispin's role reversed from that of victim to torturer.¹ The noisy return of Simon and the Waiting-woman demanding revenge or the return of their money is a telescoping and abbreviation of the French III. xiii.-xv. The ending of *The Anatomist*, while differing from that of *Crispin Médecin*, is plainly based upon it. Old Gerald's blustering return Ravenscroft adds because he has to get the character back on the stage for the finale; furthermore it adds bustle to the end of the play. Young Gerald and Angelica marry (in *Hauteroche* they merely get permission to marry); then, all being reconciled, the characters in both plays withdraw to tell over the story in detail, Crispin being the hero of the hour.

An indication of the exactness with which Ravenscroft followed his source may be gathered from the following passage, chosen almost at random :

Crispin Médecin, II., xxix.

Lise. Monsieur le Médecin, est-il ici ?

Dorine. Non.

Lise. Le voilà : pourquoi me le céler ?

Dorine. Que lui voulez-vous ?

Lise. Lui dire seulement deux mots.

Crispin. Que souhaitez-vous de moi ?

Lise. Monsieur, vous saurez que ma Maitresse a perdu un petit chien qu'elle aime éperduement ; qu'elle s'en désespère, & qu'elle en met la faute sur moi. Or, comme on m'a dit que vous savez l'art de deviner, aussi bien que la Médecine. . . .

Crispin. Je suis aussi savant en l'un comme en l'autre.

Lise. C'est ce qui me fait venir ici, pour vous prier, en payant, de m'en dire quelque nouvelle.

Anatomist, II. p. 19.

Waiting-woman. Is Mr Dr within ?

Beatrice. No.

Wait. Why do you deny him to me ? There he is.

Crispin. Well, what's your business with me, Mistress ! Speak.

Wait. My Lady has lost her little Lap-dog, which she lov'd better than any Relation in the World. She lays the fault on me, and grieves and takes on as if 'twere her only Child. I fear she'll grow Distracted if we find it not. Now, Sir, knowing that you are not only a learned Physitian but that you understand Astrology and the like—

Cris. Ay, ay, I understand one, as well as the other.

Wait. Therefore, Sir, I bring you a Fee, and desire you to tell me some tidings of him.

¹ The device of removing Angelica together with some of Old Gerald's clothing in a coffin is not in *Hauteroche's* play.

After the addition of a coarse detail (four short speeches) Ravenscroft again resumes his translation :

<i>Crispin.</i> Combien y a-t-il qu'il est perdu ?	<i>Cris.</i> O ho—lost ? how long since was he lost ?
<i>Lise.</i> Deux jours.	<i>Wait.</i> Two days ago.
<i>Crispin.</i> A quelle heure ?	<i>Cris.</i> At what hour ?
<i>Lise.</i> Sur les onze heures du matin.	<i>Wait.</i> At eleven in the morning.
<i>Crispin.</i> De quel poil est-il ?	<i>Cris.</i> What colour ?
<i>Lise.</i> Blanc & noir.	<i>Wait.</i> Black and White.
<i>Crispin.</i> C'est assez.	<i>Cris.</i> Enough, enough.

The only sizeable bit of the French play which Ravenscroft has not made use of is III. viii.—xii., in which Lisidor thinks he recognizes the disguised Crispin but cannot be sure because he speaks Latin with apparent ease and because Mirobolan vouches for him. Otherwise *The Anatomist*, with the additions and alterations noted, economically uses the whole of Hauteroche's *Crispin Médecin*.

RAYMOND E. PARSHALL.

NOTES ON COWPER'S LETTERS. IV.

THE following notes are continued from the *Review of English Studies*, vii, 182-7 ; viii, 316-9 ; and x, 76-8. They are intended to supplement Mr. Thomas Wright's edition of Cowper's correspondence by giving references to letters printed elsewhere and by offering suggestions for the placing of undated or incorrectly dated ones.

4.1 1755, Oct. 10, Hill. *Poetical Works of Cowper*, ed. Milford, p. 624.

This is a letter in verse, not a poetical epistle, and it should be included in the *Correspondence*.

268 [1783, July], Unwin. *Corr.* ii, 19.

I previously suggested (*R.E.S.*, v, 168) that this letter should be placed at the end of July 1783 ; I was not then aware that W. Hoffmann had reached the same conclusion (*William Cowpers Belesenheit und literarische Kritik*, Diss., Berlin, 1908, p. 33, note). But I now think that this date is too late. Cowper says that Bull has gone to the seaside and will be absent six weeks, and continues, " My intention is to surprise him at his return with the addition of as much more translation [of Madame Guyon] as I have already given him." He sends Bull his good wishes for the excur-

sion on June 27 (*Corr.* ii, 82), and tells him on August 3 that he had devoted a month after his departure to translating Madame Guyon (*Corr.* ii, 89). It appears that Bull left at the end of June and that Cowper's letter was written soon afterwards, *i.e.* at the beginning of July, and it should be numbered 299.1 instead of 300.1.

287.1 See 338.

299.1 See 268.

300.1 See 268.

338 1784, Newton, *Corr.* ii, 185.

This letter is headed "April, 1784." But the reference to the earthquakes in Calabria in February and March 1783 and the account of Corporal East, supplementing what Cowper had told Newton about him on March 7, 1783 (*Corr.* ii, 53), both suggest that the date is really April 1783. [= 287.1]

367 —, Nov., Hill. *Corr.* ii, 265.

This poem, *An Epistle to Joseph Hill, Esq.*, seems out of place in a collection of letters, but if it is to be included, it should be dated November 17, 1784, since Cowper tells Unwin on November 20 that he wrote it "on Wednesday last." (*Corr.* ii, 270.)

406 1785, Hesketh. *Corr.* ii, 372.

The date is November 17, 1785 (*Autograph Prices Current*, vi, 40). [= 410.1]

410.1 See 406.

424 1786, Powley. *Corr.* ii, 423.

This letter is wrongly headed "About 1786." W. Hoffmann (op. cit., p. 49, note) corrects the date to "circa 1793" on the grounds of the obvious allusion to Newton's *Letters to a Wife* (1793) and the reference to Postlethwaite's forthcoming grammar, published in 1795. But the date can be more closely defined. (1) The letter cannot have been written before the arrival of Mr. Bean, vicar of Olney, in March 1788 (*Corr.* iii, 238). (2) Cowper speaks of Postlethwaite's coming to serve for Bean, who had gone "to Bath or Bristol, or both." Bean announced his intention of going to Bath on September 8, 1793, Postlethwaite preached in Olney church on the following Sunday, September 15, and Bean had returned by September 28 (*Diary of Samuel Teedon*, 73, 74, 75). (3) Cowper is known to have been reading *Letters to a Wife* on October 22, 1793 (*Corr.* iv, 460). The letter may therefore be dated September, 1793." [= 997.2]

464 1786, June 19, Hill. *Corr.* iii, 61.

The date is clearly wrong. Cowper speaks of "my dear cousin's arrival," but Lady Hesketh did not come to Olney until June 21 (*Corr.* iii, 55, 62). He also says, "At a village two miles distant we have hired a house of Mr. Throckmorton," but on July 3 he tells Unwin that he is to dine with Mr. Throckmorton that day "and finally adjust the treaty" (*Corr.* iii, 63). Hayley, who first published the letter (*Life of Cowper*, 1803, i, 204), dates it June 9; it was probably written on July 9. [= 466.1]

464.1

See 467.

466.1

See 464.

467 —, July, Newton. *Corr.* iii, 68.

Cowper says that his work "has been in the course of this last week a little interrupted, by the arrival of my dear cousin, Lady Hesketh; but with the next week I shall, as they say, turn over a new leaf." Lady Hesketh arrived on Wednesday, June 21, and this letter ought to be dated not later than the following Saturday or Sunday. June 22, the date given to it by Grimshawe (*Life and Works of Cowper*, 1836, iii, 189) is possibly correct. [= 464.1]

784.1

See 785.2.

785.2 1792, Newton. *Memoirs of Hannah More*, 1834, ii, 287.

This letter can be dated more exactly than "January or February 1792," as suggested in my previous note (*R.E.S.*, x, 77). Cowper speaks of "waiting till Mr. B[ean]'s journey" for an opportunity of sending his verses for Patty More's album, and Teedon's *Diary*, p. 13, makes it clear that Bean went to London some time between January 21 and 26. The number of this letter should therefore be 784.1, not 785.2.

954 1793, Hesketh. *Corr.* iv, 385.

This letter is headed "No date, but probably March 1793," on the ground that Teedon writes in his diary on March 16, "Went to the Esqr's., and found the study and room over it under reparation." But in the letter Cowper speaks of the repairs to the study as being completed. The letter really belongs to May. "Johnny is the copyist" and "Johnny will speak for himself" indicate that John Johnson was staying with Cowper. He came to Weston on May 11 (*Corr.* iv, 402), and the passage in the letter about Charlotte Smith is evidently the denial referred to in Cowper's letter to Hayley of May 21 (*Corr.* iv, 407, 8). Thus no. 954 comes between May 11 and 21. [= 968.1]

968.1

See 954.

997.2

See 424.

K. POVEY.

REVIEWS

The Exeter Book, Part II : Poems IX-XXXII (E.E.T.S.).

Edited by W. S. MACKIE. London : Oxford University Press.

1934. Pp. x + 4 plates + 245. 18s. net.

MORE than forty years ago the late Sir Israel Gollancz published the first part of what he had planned as a full and thorough edition of the greatest of the O.E. MS. collections of poetry. In 1893 appeared *Part I*, being a text of the first eight poems together with a translation. Professor Mackie has now completed the editing of the text of the remaining poems with a translation.

In presenting the text, Professor Mackie has sought to follow for the most part the methods of Sir Israel Gollancz ; but he has done the work entirely anew, although the text had already been set up in unrevised proof by its first editor. He has made full use of the magnificent facsimile of the Exeter Book published in 1933 (especially in the careful reconstruction of the damaged passages near the end), while also collating the MS. itself. A few notes on variant readings are added at the end of the volume, supplementing the textual footnotes which accompany emendations throughout.

It would be ungracious at this stage to offer serious criticism of the work in detail, since *Part III*, as planned by the first editor, is to contain introductions, notes, indexes, etc. ; for this final volume may well furnish satisfactory explanations of *prima facie* errors. The MS. is easy to read except for the damaged passages, which have usually been dealt with carefully in the light of the excellent transcriptions made by Professor R. W. Chambers and Dr. Robin Flower for the Dean and Chapter of Exeter's facsimile edition. The matters that may cause objection to be made arise in the editor's own emendations and in his translations. These latter appear to be far from satisfying.

Professor Mackie's editing and translation of *The Seafarer*, which is the best known poem in the book, may serve to illustrate the kinds of apparent error on which judgment may be withheld till the appearance of *Part III* of this edition. The dubious theory

that the first part of the poem is a dialogue is emphasized in the translation; the *mid hine* of the MS. in 1. 99 is emended to *mid him ne* without comment other than mere record, though it should have been retained according to the principles enunciated in the *Preface*, since a poetical and Anglian use of *mid* with the accusative is well known and *wille* as a subjunctive enables good sense to be made out of this difficult passage; *hulpan sweg* is amazingly rendered "sound of the whale," though the evidence for some kind of bird has hitherto been universally accepted (without final agreement between the supporters of the curlew and the godwit¹); and *byrig fægriað* of 1. 48 is still translated "The cities become fair," though perhaps most scholars would now regard this older rendering as definitely misleading.

Throughout the translations there are points that seem to require justification; and the sometimes unexpected rendering of difficult passages is not helped from the reader's point of view by the preservation of the punctuation of the MS. generally. Judgment must also be suspended till the publication of *Part III* on the two appendices which close the volume—one comprising a very limited list of variant readings and the other a table of solutions to the Riddles of the Exeter Book.

Professor Mackie is to be congratulated on his accuracy in presenting the MS., and his meticulous footnotes on the damaged passages are particularly useful. He might, however, with advantage have followed up the line of investigation suggested by Mr. N. Ker in his important review of the facsimile edition in *Medium Ævum*² of the significance of MS. erasures—such as those of the *c* in *pec* in 1. 119 (cf. *The Harrowing of Hell*) and the *ic* of *usic* of 1. 127 (he prints *pe* and *us* without noting the changes in any way).

C. L. W.

The Medieval Pulpit: A Neglected Factor in the History of English Letters and of the English People. By G. R. OWST. Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. xxiv+616. 30s. net.

THAT the pulpit was once the paramount influence on our national life, that it moulded our language, inspired the beginnings of our national literature, and our popular drama, and was largely responsible

¹ But cf. the *O.E.D.*, s.v. *hwaup*.

² Vol. II., pp. 224-231.

for the Peasants' Revolt are facts not generally appreciated. Nevertheless, they are facts. Until Dr. Owst published his *Preaching in Medieval England* (1926) the influence of the pulpit on mediæval culture and society had received the scantiest attention in this country. In this respect we compared unfavourably with the French, who long ago recognized the indebtedness of their national literature to the mediæval pulpit. Vast numbers of sermon manuscripts and homiletic aids lay buried in our cathedral and other libraries, but they were regarded as unimportant and their existence ignored. Dr. Owst's book made us aware of a rich, unexplored mine of material of vital significance for the understanding of our literary, political, social, and dramatic history. It was, indeed, as one of our ablest literary historians remarked, "an epoch-making book." It introduced us to the preachers themselves—to Bromyard, Brunton, and Master Rypon—to the preaching scene and the sermons, and indicated the task the writer had in contemplation and which he has in part completed in a massive volume of over 600 pages packed with rare learning, documented with notes and references, and admirably indexed. Six years of indefatigable industry, during which he must have read hundreds of manuscripts, have gone to the making of this book. *The Medieval Pulpit* makes no claim to be an exhaustive treatise. It will require more than a single lifetime to provide an adequate bibliography of the material, and create the new perspective which the critical discussion of the material will make necessary. It is obvious at this stage of the task that, in the light of the evidence that Dr. Owst has produced, many judgments of our literary and social historians will have to be jettisoned.

The main purpose of the present volume is to demonstrate the debt that our national literature owes to the mediæval pulpit. As early as the ninth century a Council at Tours decreed that "since Latin was becoming less intelligible to the people, the homilies should be translated into the rustic tongue" and in the centuries that followed preaching in the vernacular made progress, until in the fourteenth century it became "in itself a social activity, a centre of picturesque intercourse as well as of lovely *ch talkyng* and thinking." The sermon of the early thirteenth century, besides lacking style, lacked also that bright familiarity and raciness which, when once developed, would be capable of holding the attention of the masses. This the friar, because of his contact with the people in the cities and the villages, was to provide. By the middle of the fourteenth

century the scope of the sermon had come to cover the whole range of human interests. In an age when there was a paucity of amusements and mental stimulants, the pulpit had an opportunity which it was not slow to buy up. It was the poor man's university extension society: the only way in which he could satisfy the hunger of his mind. Through the sermon he gained acquaintance with other lands, their peoples and customs. "The modern reader of newspapers cannot conceive the violence of impression caused by the spoken word on an ignorant mind lacking food."

It was the pulpit which "preserved the regular public use of the English tongue by educated men from the days of the Conquest. . . . The preacher becomes (after the coming of the friars) the chief mediating influence through which the mixed culture of mediæval Christendom permeates England." He enriched the common tongue and extended the vocabulary of the common man. For illustrating his sermons he went for the models to current life and to nature. The pulpit and not the revival of classical studies was "the true parent of a revived literary realism." It interpreted the common things of life and made them significant. The love of the commonplace which strikes the reader of Chaucer is a characteristic Chaucer shares with the preachers of his time. For nothing escapes their observation. They know the life of rich and poor, and they use their knowledge with telling effect. They employ allegory, *exempla*, satire, and fiction with equal ease. In three chapters, which occupy no less than 260 pages, "the preaching of Satire and Complaint" is discussed with astounding thoroughness: the corruption of the hierarchy and clergy, the scandals and the festering sores of the religious world, the pride and callousness of the rich and their oppression of the poor, the venality of the administration of the law; and the last chapter, which deals with the failings of women, the vicious habits of the age—drink, gluttony, avarice, lechery, pride, and extravagance. Neither the fundamental truth nor the far-reaching influence of the clerical exposure will escape the historian's eye. He will understand, as never before, the depth of feeling which lies behind the denunciatory and satiric verse of the later Middle Ages in England. "In its Satire and Complaint we touch at once the profoundest and most abiding influence of the English pulpit." The torch that in 1381 set the country in flame was dropped from the pulpit of the Church, not thrown by sectaries. "In the Peasants' Revolt, as in the later Civil War, it is still equally

impossible to say . . . where the religious influences end and the political influences begin. In both upheavals the pulpits of the land were no better than war-drums, roaring men to rebellion and to carnage. In both they were propagating, in Lord Acton's fine phrase, 'a doctrine laden with storm and havoc.' " And yet the Peasants' Revolt, regarded by the masses of the clergy with horror, made no difference to the vigour with which, after the Revolt had failed, the preachers returned to their highly inflammatory denunciations of the ruling classes.

The chapter on "Pulpit and Drama" is not the least interesting and provocative. It deserves to rank as a valuable and original contribution to our knowledge of mediæval drama. It disposes of the "evolutionary" theory which sees in the popular drama merely a development of the liturgical mystery. Dr. Owst is at variance with most of our authorities on the mediæval drama: the primary cause of their erroneous judgments is, he maintains, that they have been deceived by the Tudor writer of the *Chester Banes*, who was "either an ignorant or malicious person" who grossly distorted the facts about the plays. Not a literary historian has recognized the dependence of the plays on the sermon literature. Professor Creizenach is an exception, but even he does not seem to be aware that the comedy and humour of the plays have their origins in the proverbs, wisecracks, and *facetiae* of the pulpit. Dr. Owst is not so uncompromising in his rejection of the close relation of the popular drama to the liturgical mystery as is Dr. Oscar Cargill in his book on *Drama and Liturgy* (1933). But he is clearly of opinion that the popular drama owes more to the pulpit than to the liturgy. He regards the view that the plays sprung fundamentally from the lives of the people—"distinctively the creation of the common people with all the defects and virtues consequent upon the fact"—as arrant nonsense and is probably right in attributing the authorship or perhaps "the compilation" of the plays to clerics. The parallels which Dr. Owst marshals from the sermons for the plays which he selects for discussion leave little room for questioning the dependence of the plays upon material drawn from sermons and homiletical poems and "aids." But when this is acknowledged, it does not deprive the authors of the plays of their contribution to the creation of the drama. Some of us will accept the dependence of the plays on the sources that have been cited, and at the same time hold with Professor Pollard that the compiler, redactor, author—call him what you will—

of certain of the Towneley Plays merits the title "genius." Again, if the pulpit in effect supplied the material for our drama, the dramas reacted on the pulpit. In "The Hundred Mery Tales," which, by the way, affords ample proof of the extent to which humour was employed in the pulpit, there is the tale "of the curat that prechyd the articles of the Crede." At the end of the sermon the "curat" says: "These articles ye be bounde to beleve: for they be true of auctoryte. And yf ye beleve not me, than for a more surete and suffycient auctoryte go your way to Coventre, and there ye shall se tham all playe in Corpus Cristi playe." And lastly, is it true that open-air preaching led the way to the open-air performances of plays? Surely the first plays that were played in the churchyard were the liturgical mysteries, which, by the close of the twelfth century had in many instances become detached from the liturgy itself. The reasons given by Sir Edmund Chambers for the transfer of the plays to the churchyard still seem to me sufficient. Any play at the end of the twelfth century, even if it were not in the vernacular, would have drawn large audiences, and large audiences could not be accommodated in the churches which, on the occasions of the performance of "*officia*," were often limited in accommodation on account of the many "scaffolds" in use. The earliest reference to a play in a churchyard is in the Life of St. John of Beverley and the date is 1224. At that date vernacular preaching was not of the type to draw the crowd.

The concluding chapter "A Literary Echo of the Social Gospel" is an admirable study of *Piers Plowman* and the final pages complete the argument of the previous chapter, "that the mediæval pulpit is a long-forgotten foster-mother of our modern stage."

The *Medieval Pulpit* is, to borrow Miss Eileen Power's words, "a remarkable achievement," and "a book no student of the Middle Ages can afford to ignore."

P. E. T. WIDDRINGTON.

The Lyfe of Sir Thomas Moore, knighte. By WILLIAM ROPER. Edited from thirteen manuscripts, with collations, etc., by ELSIE VAUGHAN HITCHCOCK (E.E.T.S., Original Series, No. 197). London: H. Milford. 1935 (for 1934). Pp. lii + 142. 10s. net.

DR. HITCHCOCK has performed a valuable service in producing this very careful edition of Roper's *Life of More*. The volume opens

with a lucid introduction describing the thirteen Roper manuscripts which have been collated for this edition. The first printed edition, that by "T.P." issued in 1626, appeared with a dedication to Elizabeth, Countess of Banbury, and it would have been interesting had this clue to the identity of "T.P." and to the circumstances of the production been developed. If the evidence given in the Banbury peerage case in 1661 be accepted, Lady Banbury was living, at least from July, 1626, with the fourth Lord Vaux of Harrowden, whom she subsequently married. Lord Vaux was a grandson of Sir John Roper, later first Lord Teynham, and he may have possessed by inheritance that manuscript which "T.P." had "come upon in a friend's house." In any case the dedication throws an interesting light on the life of a wealthy Jacobean household where hereditary Catholicism and a veneration for Sir Thomas More was combined with a fashionable laxity of morals.

The second part of the introduction includes a brief life of William Roper. This is marked by carefulness and accurate research and contains one of the five pedigrees which elucidate the complicated relationships of the More circle. There is a just evaluation of Roper's position. "The literary value of Roper," Dr. Hitchcock remarks, "is, as it were, accidental, unpremeditated." An interesting note is made of his minor errors and omissions.

The text of the *Life of More*, which occupies the middle section of the book (pp. 1-104), is admirably edited and the collations are well arranged and clear. The book concludes with twenty-three pages of historical notes, a glossary, and an index. In regard to matters treated by Roper and incorporated by Harpsfield, the present editor refers readers to Professor Chambers' notes to Harpsfield for more detailed discussion. The notes on the Clements and on Giles Heron, which appear in the present volume, are particularly interesting. But in this connection the statement in reference to Henry VIII in Dr. Hitchcock's preface that "by 1603 the stock of the royal murderer was no more" jars a little. Yet this is a trivial criticism. Dr. Hitchcock is to be congratulated on an excellent piece of work very admirably executed.

DAVID MATHEW.

Shakespeare and the Homilies. By ALFRED HART. Melbourne: the University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. 262. 8s. 6d. net.

MUCH of the matter in this volume has already appeared in the *R.E.S.*, but one's only regret on finding it again, in book form, is that Mr. Hart has not thought fit to reprint all the important Tables included in the first version. One can but hope that this omission points to some future elaboration of the material in question.

"What Shakespearean study needs at present is more facts and fewer guesses" is Mr. Hart's belief, and his book is a most practical expression of what he preaches.

What, for example, was the average length of the dramatic performances to which an Elizabethan audience was accustomed? "The doctors," Mr. Hart finds, "disagree, as is usual, but by their leave, an average is not a matter of opinion but of arithmetic." Mr. Hart has accordingly made a beginning by counting the number of lines in some 233 plays. He then organizes in a most interesting manner a body of information bearing on the length of time taken by dramatic performances in Shakespeare's day; and before he is finished he has transformed what looks like a feat of endurance in arithmetic into critical conclusions of the most illuminating and important kind.

His final and most important finding is that Shakespeare was first and above all a poet and creative artist writing, from the beginning to the end of his working life, far more than could or would, as he well knew, be put on the stage.

But for the student of the text the most disturbing corollary is that neither the Folio nor the Quarto texts, of *Hamlet*, for example, running to 3,537 and 3,668 lines respectively, can be the actual stage version, since on Mr. Hart's reckoning this can hardly have exceeded about 2,400 lines.

With the simple explanation of the difference between the Q. and F. texts removed, the critic is for the time left darkling; and there will no doubt be protests. But whether future investigation bears out or not Mr. Hart's conclusions he has discussed with patience and lucidity a body of fact that must be properly allowed for, as it has not been in the past, in all subsequent discussions.

One misses from the volume the counts given in the *R.E.S.* by

which Mr. Hart put the estimate of the length of Shakespeare's plays on a new basis. But the last two papers are further instances of the application of arithmetical methods to problems that are usually treated with more assurance than knowledge.

Mr. Hart estimates, after careful counting, the stock of words Shakespeare had at his disposal during various periods and the percentage of new words he introduced from time to time. He does not, however, pretend that these inquiries will give a quantitative result that will enable the critic to dispense with his judgment, but they will, he holds, enable him to look with knowledge on what he is talking about.

As one might expect, Mr. Hart has little patience with the casual guesser: "If I defer to the judgment of Shakespeare's 'fellows' and accept 1 *Henry VI* as substantially his I shall ask these critics to put this opinion down to a bias in favour of facts." Among the facts he establishes are that "Shakespeare commenced dramatist with a much larger and more varied stock of words than any of his contemporaries," and that the large vocabulary of the *Henry VI* plays separates them from all other plays of the period ending June 1592. But here again his conclusions about *Edward III* and the *Two Noble Kinsmen* raise up disturbing questions in a walk of Shakespearean study that students with so much to do elsewhere have been willing for the moment to leave unvisited.

In addition to these admirable papers, the volume contains an examination of Shakespeare's debt to the homilies and a convincing explanation of the cuts in the Quarto of 2 *Henry IV*.

It is to be hoped students will give Mr. Hart's work the encouragement it deserves, trusting that they may induce him to continue his laborious but very helpful studies.

PETER ALEXANDER.

The Real War of the Theaters. By R. BOIES SHARPE. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. (for Modern Language Association of America); London: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. viii + 260. \$2.50; 11s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR SHARPE, in this elaborate study, retells the theatrical history of 1594-1601 from a special angle, that of the rivalry between the two leading companies, under the patronage respectively of

the Lord Chamberlain and the Lord Admiral. This, for him, has two aspects. There is an obvious competition for the pence of the public, in which he thinks, plausibly enough, that on the whole the Chamberlain's aimed at the more aristocratic, and the Admiral's at the more popular audience. He makes a careful chronological survey of the two repertories so far as known to us, and of the possible contacts and divergencies between them. The process cannot be carried very far. Most of the Admiral's plays survive in name only, and even the names of most of the Chamberlain's plays are lost. You cannot make much of a bare name, but Professor Sharpe has explored many recesses of family history and social happenings, and has as much capacity as any man for seeing what may or may not be on the other side of a brick wall. This is a harmless and sometimes a suggestive activity. But in Professor Sharpe's eyes the trade rivalry also took on a political significance. The players found their profit in supporting, so far as the censorship would permit, the conflicting interests of their lordly patrons in the struggle between the Cecils and the Earl of Essex for the domination of the mind of Elizabeth during her later years. And here there are snags to be got over. The first is that, after all, there was a fairly vigorous censorship; the next that, while the Lord Admiral was certainly a firm adherent of the Cecils, it is impossible to show that the Hunsdons, father and son, who successively became Lords Chamberlain, were in any way adherents of Essex. This Professor Sharpe attempts to get over by the desperate conjecture that they left the control of the company to younger members of the family, who were personally attached to the Earl. Incidentally, he confuses one of these, Sir Edmund Carey, with Sir Edward Cary, of another family, who was Master of the Jewel Office. I am, however, grateful to him for making it clear, in the course of his survey, how very flimsy the evidence for any pro-Essex controversy in the plays of Shakespeare really is. Nothing, of course, can be made of the singular stage-history of *Richard II*, except that no serious disgrace fell upon the Chamberlain's men for performing it upon the eve of the Earl's revolt. It had somehow, no doubt, been given a political interpretation, but even Professor Sharpe thinks that this was a perversion of Shakespeare's intention. Why he thinks that it may also have been the play given at Court on the eve of Essex's execution I do not know, and will not therefore enter into his discussion of the alternative motives which might

have determined such a choice. Oldcastle, the original designation of Falstaff, was a name in which Lord Cobham, an opponent of Essex, had a remote family interest. Shakespeare may or may not have known this. The censor did, and required a change. But in any case the players had sufficient reason of their own, apart from politics, for bearing a grudge against Cobham's house, since his father, as Lord Chamberlain, had failed to protect them against the persecution of the City. Anyone who likes may believe that Shakespeare caricatured Robert Cecil as Gobbo in *The Merchant of Venice*, and as Deformed in *Much Ado*, and escaped official reprobation. *Much Ado* has also the lines :

Where honeysuckles, ripen'd by the sun,
Forbid the sun to enter ; like favourites,
Made proud by princes, that advance their pride
Against that power that bred it.

"A bit of Essex propaganda," says Professor Sharpe. Surely "anti-Essex," if propaganda at all ! It was Essex, not Cecil, who was a favourite in the ordinary sense, and had, in the probable year of *Much Ado*, threatened to draw his sword on the queen. The "basic situation" in *As You Like It*, we are told, might easily be taken as an allusion to the banishment of Essex from court ; but on the next page it is the conversion of the wicked duke which is compared with a threat of Essex to turn monk. It is really impossible to criticize this sort of thing quite seriously. And after all, Professor Sharpe does not appear to think that Shakespeare himself cared twopence about Essex and his politics. He notes the conservatism of the plays, and adds, "Once the Cecil faction had ceased to point out their veiled or wholly imaginary political insinuations, Elizabeth, especially as her perceptions dulled with age, would no longer be likely to imagine any disloyalty in their tone." I think he must have had some qualm when he wrote that.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

The City-Madam. By PHILIP MASSINGER. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by RUDOLF KIRK. (Princeton Studies in English, 10.) Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. x+183. \$2.00; 9s. net.

THIS volume forms a welcome addition to the series of Ph.D. theses which are being devoted by students of Princeton and Bryn Mawr, under the ægis of Professor T. M. Parrott, to the plays of Massinger. Dr. Kirk offers a reliable text, he has new material to bring forward, and he is commendably ready to draw his own conclusions from all the available evidence new or old.

His most vexatious problem is to ascertain when the play was written. It was licensed on May 25, 1632, but Dr. Kirk, like others before him, finds it difficult to reconcile this with the reference Massinger makes to his "two years silence" in the prologue to *The Guardian* (licensed October 31, 1633), especially in view of the further allusion to two unsuccessful plays of which one must surely have been *The Emperour of the East* (licensed March 11, 1631). He therefore accepts Fleay's view that *The City-Madam* was not a new play when it was licensed in 1632, whilst confessing that he cannot explain why it should not have been licensed when it was written.

Fleay further appears to have held that the play was a revision by Massinger in 1632 of one written by Jonson in 1619. Dr. Kirk rejects Fleay's suggestion of a second author and dismisses his arguments for so early a date as 1619; but though he condemns the arguments he does not consider the date impossible, and he himself adduces new evidence for a date not later than 1624 to 1626. He notes the references in the text to the "Bever" as a man's head-wear (I. i. 29), and to "Hungerland bands, and Spanish quellio ruffles" as women's finery (IV. iv. 108), and Luke's reproaches of Lady Frugal in the latter context (IV. iv. 103-5) because

your borrow'd hair
Powder'd, and curl'd, was by your dressers art
Form'd like a Coronet.

Of these three fashions he states on the authority of Miss M. Channing Linthicum that Beavers were "less fashionable after 1625," that such Bands and Ruffs "were not worn by the 'higher class' after 1630," and that the style of hairdressing described was "fashionable from 1590 to 1625." Since one of the author's inten-

tions was to reprove the extravagance of citizens' wives in keeping up with or ahead of Court fashions, Dr. Kirk feels that these allusions are incompatible with a date so late as 1632.¹

It would have been easier to evaluate the sartorial evidence if Dr. Kirk had stated the grounds on which Miss Linthicum bases her precise dating of the changes of fashion, but in any case it would not count for much if it were not for the apparent discrepancies between Herbert's several entries and Massinger's prologue to *The Guardian*. The date of the play cannot be fixed with certainty until these apparent discrepancies are explained, but even on the balance of probabilities, which is all that is claimed for the earlier date, the difficulty of interpreting first-rate evidence should not make us over-value the second-rate. Dr. Kirk has given us more data to work with, but the question remains open.

On bibliographical and textual questions Dr. Kirk is on firmer ground. Despite an unhappy suggestion that certain disturbances of the type during printing took place "as the form [*sic*] was pressed down on sheet after sheet of paper"—the type certainly would have shaken loose under such treatment!—he has shown bibliographical enterprise by finding in the ornaments and initials which he reproduces from the books in which they appeared conclusive proof of what had previously been a mere guess, that the printer of the Quarto was Jane Bell. And his text appears to be sound. I have only noticed two verbal misprints: I. i. 159, *do* for *do you*, and II. ii. 207 *your* for *you*. There are also a few mis-spellings (I. iii. 67, *wondered* for *wondred*; I. iii. 146, *posesse* for *posse*; II. ii. 36, *Ecomiums* for *Encomiums*; II. iii. 13, *Indies* in Roman instead of italics; IV. iii. 11, *compulsion* for *compulsion*; IV. iv. 157, *relishes* for *rellishes*), and a few cases in which there has been ill-advised or inadvertent modernization, like the alteration of "asoon" (with a long-*s* ligature) to "as soon" (I. ii. 46, II. i. 97, etc.) and of "wiseman" to "wise man" (III. iii. 109), but there are commendably few even of these minor infidelities to copy, and for all literary purposes the text appears to be practically perfect.

The editor is rightly reluctant to accept without evidence or

¹ He also quotes two passages (II. ii. 46-9 and III. i. 24-9) which he believes contain allusions to external events, but since he is unable to identify the events and therefore makes no use of this evidence I need only say that it seems to me most unlikely that either passage had any particular reference. The first is a general sneer at the gullibility of statesmen and the latter would have provoked violent (and fully justified) protests from any ambassador who could conceive himself touched by it.

argument the suggestion that the printer's copy was possibly the author's autograph manuscript, but to this I need not here revert.¹ With regard to the series of dedications to different patrons in different copies, it may, however, be useful to make one correction and one addition. In the copy belonging to Mr. T. J. Wise (*Ashley Catalogue*, iii. 130), neither the leaf containing the dedication to the Countess of Oxford nor that containing the one to "Mr. Lee Esquire" is in fact conjugate with the leaf containing the title-page, so that it is misleading to speak of either of them² as cancelled in this copy. And, since Dr. Kirk's work went to press, the Bodleian has acquired a fresh copy dated 1658 with a previously unknown dedication to "Richard Steadwel Esquire."³

Such technical minutiae as these occupy only a quarter of Dr. Kirk's introduction. Most of the remainder will be useful, though perhaps more useful to the student of Restoration and later stage history than to the student of Massinger's plays, since a disproportionate amount of space is devoted to the analysis and stage histories of two late adaptations, *The Cure of Pride* (of 1685 or later) and Sir James Bland Burges's *Riches* (of 1810).

Massinger is a lucid writer who does not need much explanation or annotation, and Dr. Kirk was wise to dispense with a glossary and to keep his notes within narrow limits. It is true that his self-restraint has not always proved equal to the strain imposed upon it, so that his notes on the first six lines of the play include these :

I, i, 2. *Fraught*, freight. Obsolete.

I, i, 6. *paiment on the nail*. On the spot, at once, without the least delay.

Will anyone who is likely to use this edition need these notes? That is perhaps not a question to be answered too confidently. Whether or not the notes are always necessary—and there are many useful ones on the topography of Massinger's London, on fashions in clothes, and on the astrological jargon of Stargaze the almanac-maker—they have the great merit of being almost invariably correct. I do not see why the *s* in "ruffians hall" (i. ii. 76) should be treated as an error possibly due to some trick of Massinger's handwriting,

¹ See *M.L.N.*, i. 173-4.

² Actually Dr. Kirk speaks of a *page* in one instance and of a *sheet* in the other, but it seems clear that in each case he means a *leaf*.

³ See *The Bodleian Quarterly Record*, viii. 17-8.

since this form would appear from the quotations in *O.E.D.* to have been the common one ; nor, indeed, why the characteristics of Massinger's handwriting need be treated as a matter for speculation at all, when there is all the autograph manuscript of *Beleene as you List* to examine ; but these are my only cavils.

Dr. Kirk has rendered good service both to his author and to his readers, and has set before his successors in this series a new standard of accuracy and judgment.

A. K. McILWRAITH.

Gentlefolk in the Making, Studies in the History of English Courtesy Literature from 1531 to 1774. By J. E. MASON. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press ; London : M. Milford. 1935. Pp. xiv + 393. \$4.00 ; 18s. net.

THE present volume shows diligence and care, and yet leaves the reader somewhat disappointed. It is based on an extensive bibliography, partly of the author's own collecting, partly derived from his colleagues in the field whose monographs have appeared during the twenty-two years while his book was in the making ; it shows some skill in summarizing the works that it treats at greater length ; and it has a methodical plan. Nevertheless, the writer seems to find surprisingly little significance in his material. After two introductory chapters on courtesy literature in mediæval and in sixteenth-century England, the author reviews the books of the two following centuries on "parental advice," on "polite conduct," on governmental "policy," and on "civility." Perhaps this plan, though logical, is unfortunate ; for it is based on the types of book from which he drew his material rather than on the significance of this material from a literary, social, or any other point of view. The author notes stylistic changes, but only here and there ; he observes that the material is "of great importance in any consideration of English social history" ;¹ but he makes no sustained effort to show what this significance may be and, indeed, rarely attempts to separate the works that reflect actual social conditions from those that merely voice a more or less conventional ideal ; in his somewhat sketchy treatment of the conduct of Elizabethan ladies, for example, he

¹ Mason, p. 86.

allows one to suppose that in reality they followed the Biblical concept of the "weaker vessel," quite subservient to the dictates of their lords; whereas contemporary travellers assure us that they were probably the freest and most self-willed women in Europe.¹ The body of each chapter consists of summaries of pertinent works. These summaries are somewhat extended and excellent in themselves, but they are arranged by mere chronology and express no clear-cut evolution in either subject-matter or ideas; and the concluding paragraphs of these chapters have no recurrent, systematic point of view.

Even as an encyclopædic *résumé*, the book breaks down for sheer lack of space. Miss Kelso² requires almost as many pages merely for the study of the ideal gentleman in the sixteenth century—a matter which in Dr. Mason's plan would occupy but one sub-heading of one chapter. As a consequence, he omits, perhaps deliberately, some authors that one might expect to find, the Elizabethan dramatists, for example, whose plays so vividly reflect the actual conduct and etiquette of the age. Sometimes, moreover, he passes over important writers with the briefest comment. The *Faerie Queene*, for instance, has a whole Book of more than five thousand lines on courtesy; and all this is dismissed with the following short shrift:

Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1579 [*sic*]) was designed to exemplify the moral virtues as set forth by Aristotle. The sixth book deals with courtesy, the "roote of all civill conversation," which derives from the court and teaches proper behaviour "to all of each degree."³

Indeed, the writer seems uncertain as to the scope and the exact purpose of his book; and he gave it such an inclusive title that the reviewer hardly knows on what basis to discuss it. Such faults are all too common in scholarship to-day; and they reduce many learned works to the category of mere bibliographies annotated more or less with summaries and casual commentary. The present book is certainly superior to the average of such pieces; in fact it is so good that one only wishes it were better.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

¹ See the present reviewer, "Desdemona," *R.L.C.*, xiii. 337 *et seq.*

² R. Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century*, Urbana, iii., 1929.

³ Mason, p. 44.

English Literature and Culture in Russia (1553-1840).

By E. J. SIMMONS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. Pp. xii + 357. \$3.50; 15s. net.

AN interesting chapter in the history of international literary relations is here presented for the first time as a connected narrative in English. A number of special studies, notably Russian ones, had prepared the way for this synthesis, but Mr. Simmons's more ambitious study covers the entire period from the Elizabethan age, when the first trade agreements opened the way for cultural influence, down to the time of Pushkin and Lermontov. From slight beginnings in the reigns of Ivan the Terrible and Boris Godunov, the knowledge of and concern for English culture in Russia grew into a downright Anglomania in the reign of the Empress Catherine the Great. There are many curious evidences of this development. Garbled versions of Elizabethan dramas reached Russia through the medium of the *Englische Komödien* which were acted on the Continent in German; English and Scottish scientists and experts brought Western learning to Moscow and left their impress behind them; French translations of English sentimental novels inspired a series of Russian imitations, as did the satirical journals of Addison's school; the educational theories of John Locke influenced Catherine and her contemporaries; deism, as expressed in Pope, Shaftesbury, and Voltaire, was taught in the University of Moscow; and Blackstone's *Commentaries*, translated by Desnitski, inspired the projection of legal reforms in the later eighteenth century. The influence of Shakespeare alone forms a significant study in itself.

The political implications of the cultural borrowing were often important. Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich broke off relations with England after the execution of Charles I, but soon resumed them with the Commonwealth despite his indignation; the admiration of Peter the Great for Western culture, including English, led to many significant reforms; the admiration of the Decembrists for Lord Byron was not without its effect on their political actions, for in him "they saw a genius who in beautiful, compelling verse and in glorious deeds struggled against the forces of reaction and raised the battle cry of freedom. . . . Ryleev, who was hanged, carried a volume of Byron's poetry with him to the scaffold, and Marlinski, Kiukelbeker, and Yakushkin found consolation in reading his works in exile."

The most significant commentary on the history of such influence concerns the differences between the original culture and its imitation elsewhere. In the Russian satirical journals, for instance, very little originality was manifested; "it is noticeable that many of the abuses they satirized, though real enough in England, had little significance in Russia." The reason for this is clear. As Mr. Simmons points out: "such vital questions as peasant slavery, the wholesale plundering of the nobles, and the extreme injustice of the social system came in for comparatively little attention in the Russian satirical journals." Catherine herself—admirer of Locke and Voltaire though she was—limited strictly the subjects which might be discussed, and when Novikov and Emin overstepped the limits in such journals as *The Idler*, *The Painter*, and *The Infernal Post*, the whole literary movement was summarily checked.

Mr. Simmons does not often pause for critical interpretation of the facts presented. In other instances besides the affair of the journals it would be worth while to inquire more deeply into the causes for the success or failure of a literary movement; to speculate why certain literary fashions were the ones favoured at any given period. Why, for instance, did the exaggerated melancholy of Young's *Night Thoughts* find so many admirers and imitators? If Mr. Simmons seldom raises such fundamental questions, or seldom tries to answer them in the light of a philosophy of history, he has done an admirable piece of work in assembling the material and placing it before us in orderly fashion. The analytical commentary can easily follow upon his excellent presentation.

MARGARET SCHLAUCH.

The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden. Studies in Some Aspects of Seventeenth-Century Thought. By L. I. BREDVOLD. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1934. Pp. viii + 189. \$2.50.

THIS book represents a noteworthy departure from the usual scholarly approach to John Dryden. As Mr. Bredvold has remarked, the study of the poet's thought against its intellectual background has in general been clouded by various preconceptions: "that Dryden was a hireling, whose political and religious affiliations were determined by bribes and pensions; that in his most serious work he never rose intellectually above the level of ephemeral journalism;

and that the inconsistencies and contradictions with which his work abounds are conclusive evidence of a lack of intellectual character and significance." It is impossible here to retrace these beliefs to their origins, though the critic has accomplished some of his most adroit scholarship in this endeavour. More curious is the credulity of many early critics in their easy acceptance of the libels of a virulent age, even though the thought of the poet had its evident guide-posts and the scope of his reading was plainly indicated. "I will love the man that shall trace me." As plainly as Milton and with a similar high purpose, Dryden early appointed for himself the discipline that was to shape him. "A man should be learned in several sciences, and should have a reasonable, philosophical, and in some measure a mathematical head, to be a complete and excellent poet; and beside this, should have experience in all sorts of humours and manners of men, should be thoroughly skilled in conversation, and should have a great knowledge of mankind in general." It sounds like a recipe of to-day. His was an eager and experimental rather than a deeply religious age, one in which the approach, even to the inner sanctum, was rational up to the point of failure, and thereafter fideistic. By his wide reading of history and philosophy, and as a pioneer in the Royal Society, though perhaps therein the critic places too insistent an emphasis, Dryden in this book is shown in continuous pursuit of his appointed discipline.

The key to his intellectual development, the theme one might remark of Mr. Bredvold's study, is in the word scepticism. "Yet after all, I will not be too positive. *Homo sum, humani a me nihil alienum puto*. As I am a man, I must be changeable." Dryden's chance remark is but one revelation of a sceptical temper, in this book traced as parcel of a great movement from the ancients through Montaigne and Sir Thomas Browne to various members of the Royal Society. Thus his Tory allegiance has its antecedents in the ethical teachings of Pyrrho: "that, since no moral standard can be established by reason, the wise man will conform to the laws and conventions he finds about him"; and, by a similar guide, his consistent Catholicism is traceable throughout the *Religio Laici* and *The Hind and the Panther*. Mr. Bredvold discusses with clarity the place in this *milieu* of Hobbes, Glanvil, and the catholic apologetic writers, as well as the crisis in science that arose between faith and rationalism, and its answer in the poet's mind. But certain by-paths of Dryden's thought might perhaps have been

more exhaustively examined. What of the influence of Descartes, as recently suggested by Mr. C. V. Deane, and of the contemporary school of libertinism? Then it might not be out of place to include some preliminary treatment of the sceptical tendency as it displays itself in the body of Dryden's literary criticism. Yet, lacking these, the book still lays a multitude of ghosts. It is doubtful whether any well-organized critic hereafter can profitably summon up the hackneyed religious prejudice against Dryden and his fellows or present the poet himself in the light of a mere time-server. Such treatment will argue the writer as unread. It is to be hoped that the book may have its seasonable circulation amongst the lovers of the poet. "For such his work is one of the classic expressions of the conservative temperament."

ROSSELL G. HAM.

The Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland against Receiving Wood's Halfpence. By JONATHAN SWIFT. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. Pp. xcvi + 400. 21s. net.

WHEN once a forest fire has gained way it is as difficult to trace its beginnings as to confine its direction. Popular conflagrations, in like manner, often blaze up unexpectedly and embrace much more than the first ground of the outbreak. When, in 1722, the English government granted a patent to William Wood for the coinage of small money for Ireland it never occurred to the King, his ministers, or the patentee that they were to kindle in a broken and disunited people a spirit of burning patriotism and a sense of national integrity. It was not the first time that private individuals had been empowered by royal prerogative to mint money for Ireland. There seemed no reason to suspect that what had passed off before might not pass again. Walpole believed that he was meeting a need. The English ministry had been advised that so deplorable was the scarcity of small change in Ireland that employers had been reduced to paying their workmen with promissory paper.

The event was quite unforeseen. The Commissioners of Revenue in Dublin respectfully questioned the wisdom of the patent. Pamphlets began to appear. Men of all ranks joined in opposition. From the seclusion of his deanery Swift, who counted himself no Irishman, issued those famous letters which fanned the

spirit of nationalism, and the storm broke. Walpole and his advisers attempted to belittle its character. The able and judicious Carteret was sent over as Lord Lieutenant to still the raging of the people. It was not long before he recognized that a miracle, and it was not forthcoming, could alone save the situation. Walpole's good sense served him again, and the English government surrendered. The patent was withdrawn and the patentee quietly compensated.

Swift was the hero of the hour. The sign of the Drapier's Head hung in every street. He had used Wood's hated halfpence as a weapon of attack, pitting himself against Walpole, declaring the right of Irishmen to govern their own affairs. "The Remedy," he told the people of Ireland, "is wholly in your own Hands . . . by the Laws of GOD, of NATURE, of NATIONS, and of your own Country, you ARE, and OUGHT to be as FREE a People as your Brethren in England."

Mr. Herbert Davis's edition of the *Drapier's Letters* is the most complete, scholarly, accurate, and lucid account of this conflict which has yet appeared. Swift's pamphlets were published in scrubby and ill-printed small octavo. They were thence gathered in collected form, without editorial supervision, before they were reprinted in the fourth volume of Faulkner's edition of the Dean's *Works*, 1735. Even here the editorial work was slight, there are curious variants in the issues, and some notes are misleading or inaccurate. Later editors—Sheridan in the eighteenth and Nichols in the early part of the nineteenth century—attempted virtually nothing. In 1814 Sir Walter Scott, in his edition of Swift's *Works*, vol. vii., was content by way of editorial introduction to the *Drapier's Letters* to quote a long passage from Coxe's *Memoirs of Walpole*, which contained a biased and imperfectly informed account of the controversy. In a single paragraph Scott criticized Coxe, after quoting him to the length of ten pages, for "industriously" avoiding the "real subject of the dispute"—a curious example of editorial slackness. It is true that he added some original notes. A few years later Monck Mason brought to the controversy a real knowledge of the period and its pamphlet literature. The notes to his *History of St. Patrick's*, 1820, threw new light on the subject. Mr. Temple Scott's edition of the *Drapier's Letters*, 1903, which appeared as vol. vi. of the *Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, though competent, embodied little attempt at further research, and was wanting

textually and bibliographically. Mr. Herbert Davis is the first, since Monck Mason, to add definitely to our knowledge of the controversy centring in Wood's patent; he corrects misconceptions; he has made valuable use of unpublished material in the Public Record Office and elsewhere; he has ransacked libraries and collections in Ireland, England, and America; he is the first to collate the early editions thoroughly; and, in consequence, his bibliography shows that issues and variants are more in number than has been realized.

Mr. Davis's historical introduction is both a painstaking and independent piece of work. He is not content to accept statements which have been repeated for fact till they pass without question. It has been supposed, for example, on Monck Mason's credit, that the particulars of the Irish Privy Council address against the halfpence were unknown to Swift. This odd mistake has been tamely accepted by later writers, although, other evidence apart, Swift himself refers to the address at least five times in the *Drapier's Letters*. Again it has been supposed that Chief Justice Whitshed's browbeating of the Grand Jury in November, 1724, was due to their refusal to present a true bill against Harding, the printer. What really happened was an attempt to intimidate the Grand Jury into presenting an anonymous paper of *Seasonable Advice*, drawn up by Swift, and addressed to those who were chosen to serve on the jury. The fifth clause, which gave chief offence to Carteret, reflected on the self-interest and partisanship of those who held "great Employments" in the country. It was hardly possible for the government to ignore a document so outspoken, directed furthermore to influence the jury beforehand. By this time, however, the opponents of Wood were conscious that the tide of victory was flowing with them. The Grand Jury refused to present the paper as a seditious libel. A new Grand Jury went further and took the offensive, presenting as "enemies to his Majesty's Government" all persons who attempted to pass Wood's halfpence on the country.

Opposition to Wood's patent had reached its height. Carteret had the wisdom to counsel the government to put an end to the new coinage; and others of the English interest, on both sides of the channel, realized that the time had come for concession. If the opposition did not begin with Swift, it was he who stirred the hearts of a people and made of the agitation a national cause. His name

still lives in Ireland with those who scarcely know who he was or what he did. He wrote the famous letters in the character of a humble tradesman. His natural genius in political pamphleteering for ordinary men was fired by a moral and personal indignation. He set his enemies in the worst light and made incredible exaggerations plausible. He understood the value of repetition when addressing the uneducated. His pamphlets were not the best reasoned or best informed of the occasion ; but they had a far more resounding effect than any. Other tracts, for example the admirably written *Defence of the Conduct of the People of Ireland*, were more cogently argued than the letters of the Dublin Drapier, but in themselves they could not have stirred the whole country.

The editor's annotation of the *Letters* is full, and includes reprints of or long extracts from relevant publications of the day. The quality of Wood's coinage, his shifts to impose it upon Ireland, the growth of the opposition in its successive phases, as it sprang independently of Swift and as it was directed by him, are clearly presented. The *Letters* are carefully reprinted from the original pamphlets ; and variant readings of the early collected editions are shown. Most useful appendixes give lists of contemporary pamphlets and broadsides, prose and verse, relating to the Drapier and the controversy associated with him.

Mr. Davis's collations, introductory to the text of the *Letters*, reveal more editions, issues, and variants of the pamphlets, as originally printed in Dublin, than bibliographers and collectors have suspected. An interesting discovery was a folio edition of the first letter. The small octavo edition, hitherto accepted for the first, shows, save for necessary adjustments, the same setting of type. It may, therefore, be doubted whether the folio was more than a trial setting, and whether in this form it was ever published and sold. There were two Dublin editions of the second letter. Mr. Davis gives priority to the edition which has, on the title page, the words "in Fishamble-Street." In the other edition these words do not form part of the imprint. A close collation of the two editions suggests, however, a doubt whether the order of precedence, as given by Mr. Davis, should not be reversed. But this doubt involves no question of any textual importance.

It is less than three years since the first reprint of a Drapier Letter outside Dublin came to light with the discovery of a Limerick edition of the second letter. This edition is duly recorded by Mr.

Davis in his list of collations. Since his volume was in print a small quarto edition of the first letter, badly printed on four leaves, has been found. There is no imprint or any indication of place ; and the title appears as a heading to the first page. The text, carelessly set in double column divided by a perpendicular rule, ends on the recto of the last leaf of which the verso is blank. This may have been printed by Terry of Limerick, and is, possibly, the edition of the first letter advertised by him, "Price 1d.", on the title of his reprint of the second letter. At all events it was almost certainly printed outside Dublin ; and may be noted as an addition to the bibliographical list given by Mr. Davis.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

The Rivals. As it was first Acted at the Theatre Royal in Covent Garden. By R. B. SHERIDAN. Edited from the Larpent MS. by RICHARD LITTLE PURDY. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. Pp. lii+122. 21s. net.

It is to be hoped that all good English scholars go to the Huntington Library in California when they die. For, alas, when alive, owing to the exigencies of geography, only a fortunate few can make the long pilgrimage to San Marino and the imposing halls (where the assistants always seem to outnumber the students) and stately gardens (a hydrant to every square yard) in which Henry E. Huntington's astonishing collection is housed. The Library has perhaps a special attraction for the student of the eighteenth-century theatre because of its unique collections of playbills and manuscript plays. The playbills, the majority of which were John Philip Kemble's and contain notes in his hand, actually include complete runs, except for some half-dozen days, of all the Drury Lane seasons from 1751-2 to 1781-2 and all the Covent Garden seasons from 1760-1 to 1835-6. And the Larpent collection of manuscript plays is even more remarkable. It consists of the manuscripts of no less than between two and three thousand plays, many of which have never been printed, all originally submitted by the managers of the London theatres to John Larpent, the official Examiner of Plays under Walpole's Theatres Act (1737) from 1778 to 1824, and his predecessor William Chetwynd. Among the plays, moreover, are such minor or major masterpieces as Thomson's *Agamemnon* (called in the manuscript *The Death of Agamemnon* and including five

scenes omitted in the printed version), Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer* (under the earlier title of *The Novel* and with some interesting readings), Sheridan's *St. Patrick's Day* (the only reliable text of the whole farce in existence), and Coleridge's *Remorse* (many variant readings). But the gem of the whole collection is undoubtedly the original version of Sheridan's *The Rivals*, which is now printed for the first time, with an admirable introduction, by Professor R. L. Purdy of Yale.

The importance of the Larpent manuscript is that it exhibits *The Rivals* in the form, hitherto unknown, in which it was first acted. The play as Sheridan printed it, and as we know it, represents a drastic revision of the original version which he made in deference to the criticisms of his first night's audience. When *The Rivals* was acted for the first time at Covent Garden Theatre on January 17, 1775, it came very near to being damned. In addition to minor defects of characterization, plot, and style it was apparently much too long—"a full hour longer in the representation than any piece on the stage," as one disgusted spectator complained. The actors were also at fault. Nobody seems to have known his part except the Mrs. Malaprop and the Lydia Languish, and Lee, the Sir Lucius O'Trigger, who was primarily a tragic actor, was quite incredibly bad, "gabbling in an uncouth dialect, neither Welch, English, nor Irish." The audience was so hostile that the play had to be withdrawn and it was only when it reappeared eleven days later, in its revised form and with a new Sir Lucius and a word-perfect caste, that it entered into the hilarious immortality it still enjoys.

It has hitherto been assumed that *The Rivals*, in its unrevised form, must have been much longer and decidedly inferior to the play as we know it. Otherwise it seemed difficult to explain the fiasco of the first night. But Professor Purdy's discovery disproves both assumptions. The Larpent manuscript is only 500 words longer than the first edition—Professor Purdy conveniently prints the two texts in parallel columns—and it is every bit as good a play. It must have been almost entirely the badness of the acting, reinforced perhaps by a certain envy of the Sheridans' social success, that caused the first-night failure. But though Sheridan's revisions did not greatly improve his play they are interesting, even a little shocking, because they show how eager he already was to give his public exactly what it wanted. A whisper had reached him that

his Sir Lucius O'Trigger, originally drawn as an unscrupulous if genial fortune-hunter, was a libel on the Irish nation. Sheridan obligingly whitewashed him. Somebody had called Fag's glorious reference in the first scene to "Ovid's Meat-for-Horses" a pun "too contemptible even for a postilion." The reference was immediately excised. Somebody else objected to "several passages where the meaning was rather *too* plain for the ear of an audience accustomed lately to nothing from the Comic Muse but exhortations to Virtue," and Sir Anthony Absolute found himself deprived of some very pretty Restoration naughtinesses. "*For my own part,*" Sheridan wrote in the preface to the first edition, "*I see no reason why the Author of a Play should not regard a First Night's Audience, as a candid and judicious friend attending, in behalf of the Public, at his last Rehearsal.*" Professor Purdy, for his part, clearly regrets Sheridan's candid and judicious friend. He has left *The Rivals* a more polished play, but less alive, less real, than it was before his censorious pen got to work.

I have only detected one serious error in Professor Purdy's long and competent introduction. It is incorrect to say (p. li) that "*The School for Scandal* and *The Critic* got printed as best they could." *The Critic*, at any rate, was specially revised for publication by Sheridan and includes a signed dedication by him. I have, however, a personal grievance against Professor Purdy. In *The Times Literary Supplement* for November 28, 1929, I propounded the theory that the abbreviated text of *The Rivals* to be found in Mrs. Inchbald's *The British Theatre* (1808), and similar collections, represented Sheridan's final revision of the play. The conjecture caused some controversy and among others a letter was published on January 2, 1930, from Professor Purdy, announcing bluntly that I was wrong and that I would know why when his edition of the Larpent manuscript appeared. But now that the edition has appeared I have searched in vain for my refutation. Professor Purdy is still of the opinion (p. l) that the Inchbald text has not "the slightest authority so far as Sheridan is concerned," but the only evidence he is able to produce to support his contention is a marginal note of Kemble's which was only discovered by Mr. R. Crompton Rhodes (who handed on the information to Professor Purdy and myself) *after* Professor Purdy's letter was written. Moreover, he entirely misunderstands the significance of the Kemble note—which appears in a Covent Garden prompt-copy of 1803-4

against a speech of Julia's in Act I., Scene ii., and runs: "The Ladies cut this Speech very often in a very improper Manner as it is necessary for the explanation of Faulkland's Character. The Speech so cut fell by accident into the Author's hands who wrote under it 'The only Speech in the Play that cannot be omitted!—The Pruning Knife! Damme, the Axe, the Hatchet!'" Professor Purdy remarks that this "playful reminiscence of Puff's protest in *The Critic* seems to justify the opinion that Sheridan had very little part in these later stage versions." He appears to have overlooked the fact that not only is the speech in question *not* cut in the Inchbald text, but that the Inchbald text is to be found in the very prompt-copy in which Kemble entered Sheridan's protest. Kemble had been Sheridan's under-manager at Drury Lane. Is it conceivable that he would have entered Sheridan's outburst in a prompt-copy embodying a text which, if it is not Sheridan's own revision, is a tissue of cuts and alterations beside which the omission of Julia's speech would be a flea-bite? No, if the authenticity of the Inchbald text is to be attacked as little had better be said as possible about Kemble's note. It is a piece of evidence with more than one edge.

F. W. BATESON.

The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth (1787-1805). Arranged and edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. London: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xviii + 578. 25s. net.

As one opens this first instalment of the proposed three-volume edition of the Wordsworth Letters, two feelings are naturally predominant, gratitude to the editor for his admirable achievement and regret that Mr. Gordon Wordsworth is no longer able to welcome the work that could not have been accomplished without his generous aid, and which he, more than anyone, would have been able to estimate at its true value. But all lovers of Wordsworth and of his poetry are deeply indebted to Professor de Selincourt for this, his latest contribution to their understanding of the man and his work. Nothing comparable with this volume of the letters has hitherto been available. Knight's edition, as all students are aware, is not only incomplete but so culpably careless as to forfeit all claim

to scholarly accuracy. Wordsworth's handwriting is always difficult and often illegible; Dorothy "could write beautifully when she chose to take the trouble," but only too often her penmanship is almost as bad as her brother's. Knight seems to have taken no pains to decipher even legible words, nor did he scruple to alter dates, to make shots at the meaning, or to change it to suit his own views of what should have been written. It was, moreover, his deliberate opinion that "purely personal and family matters and trivial details must be left out," even though "very original and characteristic passages have to be set aside." This is not the procedure of a modern editor. Dr. de Selincourt's methods are, on the contrary, those of the exact scholar for whom no trouble is too great, and his edition is a model of careful workmanship. Moreover, at this late date he collects 241 letters, of which no fewer than 101 are not included in Knight's edition, while in "some 60 of the remaining 140" he has "been able to substitute a full text for . . . an abbreviated version." The new material contains "much that is of high biographical value" and throws light on "the passionate devotion of both William and Dorothy" to Mary Hutchinson; it adds "to our knowledge of the composition and early drafts of several of the poems, and reveal[s] with vividness and intimacy of detail a home life of rare and moving beauty."

No one pretends that either the poet or his sister can rank as a letter-writer, say, with their friend Lamb. Wordsworth's physical repugnance to the use of his pen necessarily stands in the way of natural, easy, light-hearted writing. It was not by means of his correspondence that he found his way of escape. Neither to him nor to Dorothy was there vouchsafed the capacity to produce the divine chit-chat of Cowper or the charm of Walpole's conversation-pieces. They write when they must and often very much later than they should have done so. Their letters are frequently put together at long intervals: they deal with financial worries, and family matters, with the composition and publication of William's poems, his views on public affairs, or their intercourse with friends and neighbours. But since they are entirely unaffected, honest expressions of the feelings, thoughts, and ideas of two great personalities, they are full of interest even in their trivialities and details of the daily routine at Alfoxton or Dove Cottage. And they contain much besides trivialities. These letters were written during the period when Wordsworth was producing some of his greatest poetry and

when Coleridge was the best-beloved friend of both brother and sister. They show us the poet at work :

He . . . has been out of doors these two hours though it has rained heavily all the morning. In wet weather he takes out an umbrella, chuses the most sheltered spot, and there walks backwards and forwards, and though the length of his walk be sometimes a quarter or half a mile, he is as fast bound within the chosen limits as if by prison walls. He generally composes his verses out of doors, and while he is so engaged he seldom knows how the time slips away, or hardly whether it is rain or fair (*D. W. to Lady Beaumont, May, 1804*).

William . . . is cheerfully engaged in composition and goes on with great rapidity. He is writing the poem on his own early life. . . . He walks out every morning, generally alone, and brings us in a large treat almost every time he goes (*D. W. to Mrs. Clarkson, Feb., 1804*).

We learn that he is physically affected by the necessity to revise :

He is always very ill when he tries to alter an old poem, but new composition does not hurt him so much (*D. W. to Mary Hutchinson, April, 1801*).

I should have written five times as much as I have done, but that I am prevented by an uneasiness at my stomach and side, with a dull pain about my heart. . . . Reading is now become a kind of luxury to me. When I do not read I am absolutely consumed by thinking and feeling and bodily exertions of voice or of limbs, the consequence of those feelings (*W. W. to Coleridge, 1798/9*).

We read the early drafts of such masterpieces as the *Lucy* poems ; and participate in the brother's and sister's "cultivation of pure pleasures, namely those of the intellect and affections" which Wordsworth enjoins on De Quincey ; we accompany them, alone or together, on their travels, and enjoy with them their discovery, round their home, of "little unthought-of nooks . . . as beautiful as they are shy." Finally, since these letters cover the years 1787 to 1805 and contain the intimate outpourings of the joys and sorrows of them both, it is worth emphasizing that there is no hint of the poet's supposed remorse which some critics believe to have hindered his production of magnificent poetry and to have frustrated his spiritual development. On the contrary, they show in him a growing consciousness of his mission as a great poet who ought, to a certain degree, to rectify men's feelings, to give them new compositions of feeling, to render their feelings more sane, pure, and permanent, in short more consonant to nature, that is to eternal nature and the great moving spirit of things (June, 1802).

EDITH J. MORLEY.

Matthew Arnold and France. The Poet. By IRIS ESTHER SELLS. London: Cambridge University Press. 1935. Pp. xvi+282. 12s. 6d. net.

MRS. SELLS seems to have been affected by other French influences than those she has studied in the case of Arnold. We all know the learned French professor with a theory, who confidently shows that every little fact that he comes across is substantiative evidence. Mrs. Sells has done students of the poet a service in tracing definitely what were vaguely taken for granted, the numerous correspondences between the youthful Arnold and the author of *Obermann*. But she has tried to prove too much; and her combination of research and guesswork on the love affair which brought forth the Marguerite poems is mostly sentimental romancing. Arnold recognized a congenial mind in Senancour, and in his *Obermann* poems naturally re-echoed those sayings which accorded with his own sense of disillusionment and the stoical resignation with which he schooled himself to face a cheerless destiny. Mrs. Sells quotes many passages evincing the deepest fellowship between the expositor and the writer expounded. But, surely, two of the most outspoken pieces, *To a Gipsy Child by the Sea-shore* and *Resignation*, were written before Arnold became acquainted with *Obermann*, and the sentiments are the same. Mrs. Sells will have it that the bulk of his most significant poems, including *The New Sirens*, *In Utrumque Paratus*, the long *Obermann* poems, the Marguerite series, and even *Tristram and Iseult*, *Empedocles on Etna*, and *The Church of Brou* were prompted and inspired by French influence—first Senancour, then George Sand, Vigny, Leconte de Lisle, and lastly Edgar Quinet. She lays undue stress on the circumstance that an allusion by Sainte-Beuve directed Arnold's attention to the story of Sohrab and Rustum, and claims erroneously that it was from Senancour and Leconte de Lisle that he had his first introduction to Oriental thought. Naturally there are numerous parallels between Senancour and Arnold; there are, indeed, many quotations in the *Obermann* poems, for Arnold looked eagerly for tokens of spiritual fellowship. But as to many passages of which Mrs. Sells remarks they are "strangely like" or that "it is hard to think" that an idea so sympathetic was not one of the first to be seized by Arnold from Senancour, such tell-tale phrases simply show that Mrs. Sells is easy to convince.

Though she admits that Senancour was not "a genius of Arnold's distinction," she considers him a "much more original thinker." Arnold, in short, is supposed to have put into a more beautiful poetic form what Senancour had thought and said before him. This is very different from the ordinary view, that Senancour was only a minor writer who owes to the interest Arnold took in him almost all the interest he has had for later generations. Arnold is read and will continue to be read. Senancour will be neglected except by the student. Mrs. Sells would reply that it is only Senancour that we read in Arnold's most characteristic verse. But it would not be difficult to find similar parallels in many other selected writers of a given epoch, especially when they have confessed warm sympathy and affinity of thought. Remember what Arnold himself said about the *Zeitgeist*.

Some of Mrs. Sells's *obiter dicta* are as risky as her main argument. "Side by side with Senancour, Arnold takes rank as perhaps the finest *poetic* interpreter of the Alps." But what about Shelley and Byron, not to mention Meredith? She dismisses Wordsworth except for "some striking passages in the poems of his youth," apparently a slighting reference to the great passage on crossing the Alps in *The Prelude*. By reading into the Marguerite poems a good deal that is not there, she evokes a tender little romance. Arnold was very reticent, and beyond the blue eyes and the "Daughter of France" he left no clue. Mrs. Sells thinks that the reproach for their parting rests with Marguerite, and debates whether it was on account of some obstacle or from her incapacity to love. But it is not difficult to see why Arnold regarded this amourette as one to be fought down. Mrs. Sells supposes Marguerite to have been one of the fashionable French set at Thun, not a girl of humble station. At any rate, she was not cut out for the son of Dr. Arnold. Various phrases in the poems let the secret out pretty clearly.

Doth riotous laughter now replace
Thy smile; and rouge, with stony glare
Thy cheek's soft hue?

To the lips, ah! of others
Those lips have been prest,
And others, ere I was,
Were strained to that breast.

On the Rhine should not have been put among the Marguerite poems; it is known to have had a different origin. With a good

deal of sentiment and a little ingenuity, it would be easy to construct similar love romances of Scott and Margaret Belches, Christina Rossetti and the man addressed in *Monna Innominata*, Swinburne and Miss Simon, and so on, which might have equal stage or film value with the recent vulgarizations of the Brontë and Browning biographies.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

The Trend of Modern Poetry. By G. BULLOUGH. London: Oliver & Boyd. 1934. Pp. viii + 181. 5s. net.

NEUTRALITY in face of the conflict between the right and left groups in contemporary poetry is superficially desirable yet fundamentally impossible, and Professor Bullough's survey of the last fifty years of English verse demonstrates both the desirability and the impossibility of the detached attitude which he seeks. He comments upon some hundred and fifty poets past and present in less than two hundred pages, and succeeds in providing an uncommonly sensible brief guide—perhaps the best that is available. But sensibleness does not fully satisfy where poetic sensibility is more patently needed, and the key to the contemporary situation in poetry is too lightly thrown away when the author remarks that he has taken pains to avoid, among other errors, that of "those who, strong in æsthetic dogmas, have seen the living wood only in one exotic kind of tree." Mr. Bullough so generously strives to show the living wood in all the trees that he sometimes comes near to falling into the error of suggesting to the uncritical mind that stained deal is as good as walnut and ebony. Thus, in the chapter on Georgian Poetry, he vitiates the critical acumen displayed elsewhere in his book by placidly defending what might with more true service to the Georgians' reputation be uncompromisingly attacked. He acknowledges that they were often "banal and trivial in sentiment and imagery" and "prosaic in rhythm," but asserts that they broke from the shackles of a purely literary tradition and from the bondage of second-hand emotion, through "their tentative probing of conscious thought-processes." This misses the validity of the old gibe that the Georgians were the "week-end school of poetry" for their movement was a specifically literary one and they rarely looked at the outside world except through the diamond-paned window of a week-end cottage. Their verse was, and is still, pleasant

enough, but for the most part it undertook no independent personal investigation of the universe and it neither discovered anything new or different nor expressed the finely and profoundly familiar with any new illumination of phrase. It was this absence of urgent reality which moved the younger modernists to fall headlong into a mood of disgust with the Georgians, and to plunge into a freshly fallacious supposition that the kestrel and the phoenix have a poetic significance necessarily more legitimate for the present than the overworked nightingale and lamb. Mr. Bullough rightly separates Mr. de la Mare from the Georgian group, and it might have been sounder to do likewise with Edward Thomas, who was a true country poet amid the ruck of pseudo-nature poets, and whose genius of reticence and withdrawal imparted to his verse a subtle personal music unique in its time. And is not Mr. Abercrombie's *The Sale of St. Thomas* a work that puts him, too, apart from the minors?

Such questions and doubts, however, belong to old skirmishes that matter little at the moment, when what many readers of poetry require most is an intelligible guide to the "difficult" contemporaries; and Professor Bullough's first and last two chapters are valuable for this purpose, showing as they do the relationship between the contemporary social and political scene and present-day poetry, as well as the link between past and present which brings the apparently isolated modernists into the main traditional stream of English poetry.

A. C. WARD.

A Dictionary of Modern American Usage. By H. W. HOWELL. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. Pp. xii + 360. 7s. 6d. net.

GIVING this volume the once-over (which "denotes a *cursor* survey, as distinct from a detailed scrutiny"), anyone who surveys only cursorily the title, the binding, and the format will not be surprised at the opening phrase of the blurb: "A companion to Fowler's *Modern English Usage*."¹ But no sooner does detailed scrutiny begin than the resemblance between the two companions is found to be barely skin-deep. The rest of the blurb quite candidly details

¹ Reviewed in *R.E.S.*, vol. 2 (1926), p. 490.

points in which *M.A.U.* differs from *M.E.U.*; while Mr. Horwill's preface leads off with so trenchant a rebutment—"the two books are radically different in their purpose"—that one suspects their similarity was not his choice. Indeed, seeing that the resemblance is so soon done for, one wonders what it was begun for.

One great merit of *M.E.U.* certainly is shared by *M.A.U.* Mr. Horwill says that his book "is not based on other dictionaries but upon material I have collected independently during more than thirty years, six of which were spent in the United States." As it was in 1902 that Mr. Horwill, then in New York, began his practice of noting down differences of English and American idiom, the *Modern* of his title in fact covers a greater range of years than is covered by *M.E.U.*, for the Fowler brothers began in 1911 the work which one of them lived to finish in 1926. Again, the significance of the word *usage* is different; we know by now that much of the Fowler material—to our benefit and entertainment—consists of English misusage; whereas Mr. Horwill frankly disclaims any intention of seeking to "teach Americans how to write or speak American." He has been "a chiel among them takin' notes" and no more.

Of the language that is common to both countries, this dictionary is concerned only with so much—whether words, compounds, phrases, or idioms—as means or might mean one thing to an Englishman and another to an American. Mr. Horwill notes among these differences in usage nine classes, not mutually exclusive; as for example, words which in America imply something quite different, or partly different, from their accepted English meaning; words which have retained in America a special significance which they once had in England but have lost; words which have acquired in America a figurative use not associated with their English usage; and so forth. Much transatlantic interchange has, of course, already occurred, and is continuing with increasing rapidity; the raw material of language originally exported from England has been manufactured by America into goods which she re-exports to the mother country. The compound *try out* (meaning "test") was good Elizabethan English; it has been preserved in America, and is now coming back home, in speech and in print, on records and on films.

A great deal of American social history is preserved in many of Mr. Horwill's entries, for much of his material has been purposely

collected from "official" American; that is, from books and magazines and newspapers dealing seriously with politics and law and sociology. This part of his collectanea is the least familiar to us: how many English political or economic students could differentiate between *blue laws* and *blue sky laws*? On the other hand, many phrases, chiefly of the picturesque metaphorical type which America coins so easily, are already so much at home in current, if not standard, English that it comes as a slight shock to be told of their American origin: e.g. *a back number*, *bedrock*, *fills the bill*, *to put it across*. Naturally, however, we do not adopt from across the Atlantic expressions which would be ambiguous here: the expression *a wrecking crew* makes an Englishman think vaguely of smugglers, or perhaps of pirates scuttling a ship—something at least maritime; but in America it means what we call a "breakdown gang."

Mr. Horwill writes admirably concise and interesting notes, and nothing is too small for the mesh of his net. His articles, for example, on *do*, *get*, *go*, *in*, *on*, and *some* illuminate clearly a number of delicate distinctions of usage, e.g.—

ENGLISH

I hadn't got time.
The man in the street.
I haven't seen him for years.

AMERICAN

I didn't have time.
The man on the street.
I haven't seen him in years.

The oddly meiotic use of *some* is adequately noted, but "and then *some*" is omitted. Under *get* and *go* we learn about *go-getter*, but not about "get going." *You all* provides a curiously interesting article. *Bromide* was invented in 1907 by Gelett Burgess (of worldwide fame as the author of the Purple Cow quatrain) and is now a standard synonym for "hackneyed." *Cut* (vb. or sb.) meaning "reduce" or "reduction," generally of wages, was actually in American use in 1905; though we adopted it barely five years ago, it is now daily familiar. We used, from 1922, *axe* in a similar sense (of staffs), and still use it: but Americans do not seem to ax their surplus executives. (Incidentally we recollect that Captain Joshua Slocum wielded an *adz*.)

"This does not profess to be a dictionary of Americanisms," Mr. Horwill warns us; he could not include everything, and has tried to draw a line between slang and colloquialisms. In this respect, we fear, his claim "to assist English people who read American books and magazines" is most weak. It is difficult to

perceive the principles on which he has included this and omitted that, and the four pages of Index are very inadequate. Mr. George M. Babbitt (*Babbitt*, chap. VII, section 4) states his dislike of "the guys that pan and roast and kick and beef": Mr. Horwill explains *guy* and *roast* and *kick*, but not *pan* or *beef*. And as he admits *bughouse*, why are there no entries for *bum*, *folks*, *dog* (swagger), *closet*, *sore* (vexed), *whale* ("a whale of a —"), etc.? These are all good English words with distinct American usages. The article on *hand* does not explain the phrase "I got to hand it to you." There is no article on *he* to expound "he-man," "he-literature," etc. *Dandy* is included, but not *swell*; *mill around* is there, but not *bat around*. The principle American industry is conspicuously absent, neither *film*, *movie*, *talkie*, *screen*, nor *fade-out* securing notice: *fan* is there and *mail* is there, but no hint of the characteristically modern social habit implied in *fan-mail*. Mr. Horwill is naturally aware that the process of coining new phrases is going on, as well as their transference across the Atlantic, even while his book is in the press; in a book made available to English readers in the week in which this review was written—Willa Cather's *Lucy Gayheart*—a character says "I have a trade-last for you," a phrase on which neither this dictionary nor any other known to us throws any light.

In the other direction—looking backward to the nineteenth century—a diligent reader of American literature, who began his studies nearly fifty years ago with *What Katy Did*, is still wondering what exactly is "tapestry brick," and what would have been the functions of the "vestryman" that Euphemia desired the master of *Rudder Grange* to become. And is *Huckleberry Finn* out of date, or slang, or dialect? Twice in his first paragraph Huck uses *without* in the sense of "unless," a usage about which Mr. Horwill is silent; and though his use of *considerable* is duly noted, the parallel *tolerable* is not.

But this is to bark up the wrong tree. We must await, as Mr. Horwill says, the outcome of the labours of Sir William Craigie and his staff at Chicago, when doubtless all such problems will be solved in *The Historical Dictionary of American English*. Meanwhile Mr. Horwill's collections, which must already have saved the Chicago compilers a great deal of work, are of immense value and interest to all students of English, and provide much curious information. For one detail we are profoundly grateful. Everyone knows that Americans record their bodily weight in pounds; but until now the

present reviewer at least never knew why. The American hundred-weight is 100 lb. (which seems reasonable, on due consideration), and the ton is 2,000 lb. The "stone" is unknown to them—perhaps because 14 into 100 won't go.

F. S.

English Pronunciation from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century. A Handbook to the study of Historical Grammar. Selected and Edited by CONSTANCE DAVIES. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd. 1934. Pp. xvi + 167. 6s. net.

THE aim of this handbook is "to provide the beginner in historical grammar with a suitable body of first-hand material to serve him as an interesting and intelligible introduction to his subject." After a brief introduction, in which this statement is explained and amplified, there follows a concise summary of the developments in pronunciation which characterize earlier modern English (Miss Davies uses the Germanizing term *New English* throughout), which have been "established by authoritative historians." The body of the book consists of illustrative extracts (126 pages) from well-known colloquial printed documents, such as the collections of letters and papers associated with the families of Paston, Stonors Cely, and Verney. These passages are accompanied by footnotes, which indicate the meanings of difficult words and phrases and are followed by an index of spellings which is rather selective.

Had this little volume been restricted to plain texts, it would have been a most valuable aid to university students, for whom the author—herself formerly a lecturer in the University of Reading—has designed it: for it is true that there exists no other easily accessible body of illustrative passages for the study of colloquial English of the period covered here—the early fifteenth to the early eighteenth centuries. But the information that the problems of early Modern English phonology have been solved and the answers tabulated by the aid of "authoritative grammarians" will come as a shock to most of those whose business it is to guide the studies of undergraduates. Indeed, this most dogmatic summarizing of phonological developments based on the widely known works of Professor Wyld with occasional reference to the first volume of Dr. Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*, may well be thought to imply an attitude towards the subject which is fundamentally unsound and especially dangerous for the beginner. Of course, all will agree in regarding

Professors Wyld and Jespersen as "authoritative" in the sense that they have made immensely valuable and universally acknowledged contributions to our knowledge of the history of English pronunciation: but to use these distinguished names to mislead the student into believing that the fascinating and difficult problems he is called upon to approach have already been reduced to established results is unpardonable. There are, too, other views on some at least of the problems of the history of English sounds which many teachers may also regard as "authoritative," though no other names are mentioned and there is no sort of bibliography.

Neither is it at all clear what previous studies are envisaged by this book. The summary of vowel-changes implies a knowledge of Middle English sounds: yet the footnotes to the excerpts often explain quite obvious forms, such as *her* = *their*. Again, the beginner in historical grammar is invited to study the language of colloquial, and often dialectal documents: but ought he not first to make himself acquainted with the language of outstanding literary monuments? Miss Davies evidently is aware that in studying colloquial documents as an aid to grasping the development of "standard English" "area of origin must be given due weight": yet the beginner is never reminded of the East-Anglian features in the language of some of the Paston writers or their scribes; and Margaret Paston's spellings *Ryth* (right) and *waste* (wist) on pp. 24 and 25 are neither explained nor indexed.

As is to be expected in a work of this type, too much emphasis is laid in the introduction and the phonology on occasional spellings as evidence for the history of pronunciation, though Miss Davies shows that she is aware of the need for caution in using them. The phonetic representation of sounds is not very carefully carried out in detail and there is often confusion between changes in spelling which are merely graphic and those which indicate change of sound. As almost exclusively printed works have been used for the illustrative extracts, the book does not pretend to be authoritative on texts, and some liberty has been taken at times with the arrangement of the letters re-printed.

A few matters of detail may be noticed to illustrate some of the points mentioned above. There is much vagueness in the use of the overworked symbol >, which is generally employed by scholars as an abbreviation for the word "becomes":—we read on p. 16 that *wh* (no phonetic transcription) "> voiced"; but on the next

page the beginner learns that “*d* and *t* and *th* (no phonetic indications) > interchangeable”! As an illustration that the stressed short *a* was “fronted during the fifteenth century” (not everyone admits this) the spelling *Messe* on p. 1 is not a happy example; for though the O.E. has *Mæsse*, there is the French *Messe* to be reckoned with. On p. 1, the explanation of the change of M.E. *ar* consonant in early Modern English is very oddly stated—the macron over the *a* of the lengthened vowel is missing, and the spelling *clarke* is given (M.E. *clerk*) as the example! On p. 5 we read that the M.E. *ē* “was tensed to [ɛ]”—perhaps too brief an expression even for the beginner. Throughout the citations from the Paston Letters (from Gairdner) the *z*’s are changed to *3* whenever the M.E. spelling suggests this; but no note is provided for the student on the question of *3*, *z*, and *y* in fifteenth-century handwriting, nor is it indicated that the MSS. of most of the documents are no longer extant.

If, however, the teacher can persuade himself to forget almost everything that Miss Davies has seen fit to add by way of apparatus to her excerpts, the book will be found to be really useful for working with undergraduates: for the re-printing is generally accurate, and there was a real need for a series of interesting passages of the kind here given to the public.

C. L. W.

Handbuch der Mittel-Englischen Grammatik. I. Teil:

Lautlehre. Von R. JORDAN (Zweite durchgesehene Auflage bearbeitet von Dr. H. Chr. Matthes). Heidelberg: Carl Winter’s Universitätsbuchhandlung. 1934. Pp. xiv + 294. Mk. 6.65; geb. Mk. 8.30.

WHEN the late Professor Jordan’s principal work, of which a most welcome revised edition is now published, first appeared, Miss D. Everett wrote in *The Year’s Work in English Studies* for 1925:

“Had Professor Jordan lived to complete his *Handbuch der Mittlenglischen Grammatik*, we should have had at last a comprehensive and detailed survey of the English language during the Middle English period, not limited, as are most M.E. ‘Grammars,’ to the needs of beginners. As it is, the first part of his book easily takes its place as the authority on M.E. phonology.”

Little need be added to this tribute, whose truth has only been emphasized by the years that have passed since Professor Jordan’s early death ten years ago for all those who have used the book. It

remains to-day the best work of its kind from every point of view ; and the loss of the *Formenlehre* which Jordan had only projected is one which seems likely to remain irreparable for long.

Dr. Matthes, as all who know his distinguished work on the *Ormmulum* would expect, has done his work well. While correcting a number of misprints and ambiguous passages, he has added a few notes and further references so as to bring the volume up to date. But a just reverence for the outstanding scholarship of Jordan's pioneer work has prevented him from making any considerable changes in the plan of the whole or in any major matters. The convenient device of indicating Dr. Matthes' new notes by a marginal *N* makes it possible for the student already familiar with the original edition to see at a glance what supplementary information has now been made available—altogether some 20 pages of new matter will be found scattered throughout the book, including a useful index of authors. Richard Jordan's brother, Dr. Hermann Jordan, has added a simple and moving biographical note at the end, which all will be interested to read.

C. L. W.

SHORT NOTICES

The Larke : a Seventeenth-century Poem ascribed to Dr. Arthur Duke. Edited by GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Privately Printed in the Department of English at University College, London. MCMXXXIV. 1s. net.

The Department of English at University College, London, has recently set up a hand-press built according to the specifications of a writer of the late seventeenth-century. This is a press of practically the same kind as that used by the Elizabethan printers, and is intended to assist in the bibliographical studies of the Department and also to be used for the printing of rare literary works. Its first production, printed by Mr. Geoffrey Tillotson and Dr. A. H. Smith, is the text of *The Larke*, a poem of forty-two lines in heroic couplets taken from Harl. MS. 6947 (f. 193) in the British Museum, where it is ascribed to "Dr. Duke." Mr. Tillotson in his short Preface shows that it must have been written before 1649, as Lord Capell, who was executed in that year, copied it into his commonplace book (Harl. MS. 3511). He identifies Dr. Duke with Dr. Arthur Duke or Duck, who was executed in the same year as Lord Capell, and who is described by Wood as "a person of smooth language" and "a tolerable Poet." If the poem is by Arthur Duke, it certainly justifies Wood's description. It consists of one elaborate and ingeniously worked out conceit in which the actual flight of the bird is identified with the metaphorical "flight" of its song. No better example of the peculiar blend of intellectual and imaginative agility fashionable in the mid-seventeenth century could be given than the lines in which the poet thoroughly enjoys interweaving the two notions of music and flight :

To the observing ear, attentive eye,
Her wings would seem to chant, her tongue to fly.

On the other hand the perspicuity of the diction and the regular march of the

couplets (which are mostly end-stopped) show that the age of Dryden is not far off.

Mr. Tillotson is to be congratulated on having disinterred and made available for students a pleasant poem which is also a valuable and significant example of seventeenth-century verse. It is to be hoped that he and Dr. Smith will continue to produce similar pamphlets for the delight of typographical experts, students of English literature, and lovers of poetry.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Dreams in Old Norse Literature and their Affinities in Folklore.

With an Appendix containing the Icelandic Texts and Translations.

By GEORGIA DUNHAM KELCHNER. Cambridge University Press.

1935. Pp. vi+154. 10s. 6d. net.

Dr. Georgia Kelchner's Appendix is a collection of all the "dream" passages in O.N. literature with translations, and the first 76 pages of her book are, in effect, a commentary on them and an endeavour to trace in later folklore the survival or disappearance of the beliefs expressed or implied in them. She is sometimes inclined to strain the argument, e.g. none of the "instances" at the foot of p. 48 is necessarily "a reflection of the remark whispered by Óðinn in Baldr's ear as he was laid on the funeral pyre"; and it is hard to follow the logic of a sentence on p. 31: "That the *disir* were originally thought of as the dead (though I have found no other instance where they are so described) is supported both by the theory of Reichborn-Kjennerud that in old folk-belief the Norns were the souls of the dead, and by the suggestion that *disir* worship 'may possibly be a cult of ancestors.'" On pp. 73-4 this shaky series of assumptions and suggestions ends in "Trolls, like the guardian spirits, were probably originally the souls of the dead." One would like a little more certain evidence. But the information collected is interesting and suggestive. The book has one grave defect: there is an Index of Dreams, which is scarcely needed, since it refers only to the Appendix in which the dreams are arranged in alphabetical order of sources; but there is no General Index, so that it is sometimes extremely difficult to refer back from the text of the dream to the comments on it.

E. C. B.

Les Grands Ecrivains Etrangers. Dante Gabriel Rossetti. By L.

WOLFF. Paris: H. Didier. 1934. Pp. 320.

Professor L. Wolff's study of Rossetti ought to be read not only by French readers. They will appreciate more highly the translations than an English reader can, but English readers too should value the learning, the acute criticism, the balanced judgment, and the enthusiasm of the book. There is no index, but there is a most useful bibliography.

E. C. B.

Les Grands Ecrivains Etrangers. John Galsworthy. I. Le Roman-

cier. EDOUARD GUYOT. Paris: H. Didier. 1933. Pp. 234.

This is the first volume of Professor Edouard Guyot's study of Galsworthy; the second will deal with Galsworthy's short stories and plays and consider him finally as an artist. Some repetition may be necessary in it, since Professor Guyot has much to say here of ideas which were recurrent in Galsworthy's mind. "L'Evangile de la Pitié" might be the title of a chapter on several of the plays, and the exposition of "Forsyatism" is not found only in the novels. In this first volume Professor Guyot, after a preliminary chapter "De l'homme à l'écrivain," proceeds to examine the novels one by one and as a series, with a particularly interesting "Diagnostic du forsyatisme" as one chapter, and reserves his final judgments for his second volume. The only criticism which it is fair to make on a section of a complete study is that, in this volume at least, he appears to take Galsworthy as giving us, in the words of his preface, "la quintessence de l'Angleterre moderne": whereas the fact is that it is, in the novels if not in the plays, the quintessence of a very small social class.

E. C. B.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, Vol. LVII., January 1936—

New Light on the Classical Scholarship of Thomas Gray (LaRue Van Hook), pp. 1-9.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Manchester, Vol. 20, January 1936—

Mrs. Gaskell (R. D. Waller), pp. 25-27.

Further note on her contributions to *Sartain's Union Magazine*.

The Printing of Mrs. Piozzi's Anecdotes of Dr. Johnson (J. L. Clifford), pp. 157-72.

ELH, Vol. 3, March 1936—

Fielding's *Amelia*: An Interpretation (George Sherburn), pp. 1-14.

The Letters of De Quincey to Wordsworth, 1803-1807 (H. A. Eaton), pp. 15-30.

Text and comment.

Thomas Holcroft: A Satirist in the Stream of Sentimentalism (Virgil R. Stallbaumer), pp. 31-62.

King Lear—Another Contemporary Account (Dorothy F. Atkinson), pp. 63-66.

Gerard Legh's *Accedens of Armory*, 1562, as one source of Shakespeare's tragedy.

Essex and Book Five of the *Faerie Queene* (Ray Heffner), pp. 67-82.

Milton and Dryden: A Comparison and Contrast in Poetic Ideas and Poetic Method (Bonamy Dobrée), pp. 83-100.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 70, Heft 3, March 1936—

Drei Anmerkungen zur Texterklärung (Fr. Klaeber), pp. 333-36.

Waldere, II. 4 ff.; Garulf, Guðlaf's son, in the Finnsburg Fragment; *Widsith*, 45.

"Old maids lead apes in hell" (B. J. Whiting), pp. 337-51.

Origin and widespread use of phrase.

King Lear and his daughters (P. Fijn van Draat), pp. 352-57.

Suggested reconstruction of their earlier history.

Newtonianism in James Thomson's poetry (H. Drennon), pp. 358-72.

Neue Variationen zum Tristanthema (A. Ehrentreich), pp. 373-80.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XVIII., February 1936—

The Verbs with Direct and Indirect Object Re-Examined (G. Kirchner), pp. 1-16.

Supplementing Poutsma's list.

— April—

Robert Herrick, Novelist of American Democracy (H. Lüdecke), pp. 49-37.

On the Function of Naming (Otto Funke), pp. 57-62.

The Etymology of the Word *Tinker* (E. Ekwall), pp. 63-67.

Aristotelianism and Anti-Puritanism in Spenser's Allegory of the Three Sisters (E. Buyssens), pp. 68-73.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 168, Heft 3, 4, December 1935—

Der germanische Kult und die ae. Feminina auf -icge und -estre (F. Mezger), pp. 177-84.

Sacerdotal Science in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, II (W. C. Curry), pp. 185-96.

Shakespeare bei Kleist (Carl Fries), pp. 232-35.

Ein ags. Sternbildname (Hermann Harder), pp. 235-37.
Rædgasram Hyades.

The Authorship of "A soldier and a sailor" (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 237-40.

Ben's song in *Love for Love*.

— Vol. 169, Heft 1, 2, April 1936—

Der gegenwärtige Stand der englischen Ortsnamenforschung (Hans Marcus), pp. 18-29.

Zum neuen mittenglischen Wörterbuch (H. Marcus), pp. 30-35.

The Early Vogue of *The Ring and the Book* (Helen P. Pettigrew), pp. 36-47.

Die Inschrift der grossen Nordendorfer Spange (H. Harder), pp. 65-68.

Neue Texte schottischer Volksballaden (A. Brandl), p. 71.

Lochmaben Harper.

A Handful of Recent Wellerisms (B. J. Whiting), pp. 71-75.

LIBRARY, Vol. XVI., March 1936—

English Song-books, 1651-1702, and their Publishers (Cyrus L. Day and Eleanore B. Murrie), pp. 356-401.

Some Exchequer Cases involving Members of the Book Trade—1534-1558 (H. J. Byrom), pp. 402-17.

Manuscript Notes in the Bodleian Copy of Bright's *Characterie* (Madeleine Doran), pp. 418-24.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 379

Contributions toward a Milton Bibliography (W. R. Parker), pp. 425-38.

The printer of *Comus* and some early tracts.

"Parchment" and "Vellum" (W. Lee Ustick), pp. 439-43.

A Note on Robert Greene's *Planetomachia* (1585) (Chauncey Saunders and William A. Jackson), pp. 444-47.

A Bibliographical Note on Richardson's *Clarissa* (W. M. Sale, Jun.), pp. 448-51.

Vols. 3 and 4 of the first edition.

Some Ornamental Initials used by Plateanus of Wesel (Honor McCusker), pp. 452-54.

"Printed for" (R. W. Chapman), p. 455.

Signification of the formula.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. V., February 1936—

The Text of *The Scale of Perfection* (Helen L. Gardner), pp. 11-30.

Alexander and the Earthly Paradise in Mediæval English Writings (M. M. Lascelles), pp. 31-47.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LI., March 1936—

Wordsworth's Adolescence (R. D. Havens), pp. 137-42.

Interpretation of *The Prelude*, II., 280-303 (A text).

Articles in *Fraser's Magazine* attributed to Carlyle (Hill Shine), pp. 142-45.

Evidence against his authorship.

Did Thomas Warton borrow from Himself? (F. S. Miller), pp. 151-54.

"Verses written . . . in Mr. Warton's *Observations* on Spenser" and Warton's ode "Sent to Mr. Upton, On his Edition of the *Faerie Queene*."

Pope's Debt to One of His Dunces (J. C. Hodges), pp. 154-58.

Blackmore's *Kit-Cats*.

Gulliver and Dampier (A. W. Secord), p. 159.

Dampier's report of the "Antelope."

A Source for Swift's *A Meditation Upon a Broom-Stick* (C. M. Webster), p. 160.

Gascoigne's *The Viewe of Worldly Vanities*.

Milton and Lord Brooke on the Church (G. W. Whiting), pp. 161-66.

Clarence in the Malmsey-Butt (J. W. Spargo), pp. 166-73.

Drowning in a butt of water as punishment in the Netherlands.

— April —

The Reviewers and the New Trends in Poetry, 1754-1770 (E. N. Hooker), pp. 207-14.

Shelley and Milton's "Chariot of Paternal Deity" (J. H. Smith), pp. 215-17.

Reappearances of images and phrasing.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LI., April 1936—

Restoration Prompt Notes and Stage Practices (W. S. Clark), pp. 226-30.

Fynes Moryson and Jonson's Puntarvolo (H. L. Snuggs), pp. 230-34.
Moryson's "dealing upon returns."

Abnormal Psychology in John Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* (L. Babb), pp. 234-37.

Perkin's delusion due to the humour melancholy.

Parallels between *Soliman and Perseda* and Garnier's *Bradamante* (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 237-41.

Falstaff in the *Mercurius Aulicus* (P. B. Mitchell), p. 241.

Reference in number for July 13-20, 1645.

Recent Works on Prose Fiction before 1800 (Ernest Bernbaum), pp. 244-55.

May—

Has Chaucer's "Wretched Engendering" been found? (J. S. P. Tatlock), pp. 275-84.

Did Chaucer write "An Holy Medytacion"? (Germaine Dempster), pp. 284-95.

Both criticizing Professor Carleton Brown's suggestion.

An Affirmative Reply (Carleton Brown), pp. 295-300.

The Arming of Sir Thopas (Irving Linn), pp. 300-11.

The tradition of the romances.

Sir Thopas and David and Goliath (Laura Hibbard Loomis), pp. 311-13.

The giant and his "staf-slinge."

Two Chaucer Notes (Roland M. Smith), pp. 314-17.

The name of Sir Thopas; unlucky days in the Chaucer tradition.

Three Notes on the Knight's Tale (Roland M. Smith), pp. 318-22.

"Under the sonne"; "The thridde nyght in May"; the description of the tournament.

More on Chaucer's Pardoner's Prologue (VI. [C], 377-390) (B. J. Whiting), pp. 322-27.

Some Notes on Heraldry and Chaucer (Dorothy F. Atkinson), pp. 328-31.

References in sixteenth and seventeenth century treatises on heraldry.

Old English *Priusa* "Tabanus Bovinus" (Phillips Barry), pp. 331-35.
Origin of word and variant forms.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXI., April 1936—

What happens in *Hamlet*? (W. W. Greg), pp. 145-54.

Reply to Professor Dover Wilson.

Thomas Dekker and the "Overburian" Characters (W. J. Paylor), pp. 155-60.

Coleridge as a Philologist (L. A. Willoughby), pp. 176-201.

"Concerning Wade . . ." (J. A. W. Bennett), pp. 202-03.

Troilus and Criseyde, III. 614: implying reference to Wade's part in the wooing of Hild?

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 381

William Jackson on Prior's Use of Montaigne (H. B. Wright), pp. 203-05.

Essay "On Literary Thievery" in *The Four Ages*, 1798.

Ducis's Two "Hamlets" (B. W. Downs), pp. 206-08.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIII., February 1936—

By What Route did the Romantic Tradition of Arthur reach the French? (Roger S. Loomis), pp. 225-38.

Three Terms of the Corpuscularian Philosophy (G. K. Chalmers), pp. 243-60.

Effluvium, effluxion, emission.

Mistress Delariviere Manley's Biography (P. B. Anderson), pp. 261-78.

William Pittis and Queen Anne Journalism, II. (T. F. M. Newton) pp. 279-302.

A Noble Savage on the Stage (W. Huse), pp. 303-16.

The Covent Garden pantomime *Omai*, 1785.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 21, Part 3, 1936—

Een nieuwe Beowulf-theorie (J. de Vries), pp. 212-19.

Discussion of Professor Berendsohn's theory.

Een Phonetikus uit de 17de eeuw (Judica I. H. Mendels), pp. 219-25.

Francis Lodwick's *Essay towards an Universal Alphabet* in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, XVI., 1686/87.

Engelsche zangwijzen bij Hollandsche Dichters, II. (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 225-40.

NINETEENTH CENTURY, Vol. CXIX., March 1936—

How Press and Public received *The Pickwick Papers* (Walter Dexter), pp. 318-29.

May—

Bishop Butler and his *Analogy of Religion* (R. E. Stedman), pp. 612-23.

Samuel Pepys, Naval Administrator (Melvin F. Talbot), pp. 624-39.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 170, February 1, 1936—

A Glossary of Somerset Dialect (W. W. Gill), pp. 74-77.

Continued weekly till March 28, pp. 97-100, 111-13, 133-35, 147-51, 165-68, 183-86, 201-03, 224-26.

February 15—

Addison and Sir Henry Newton (W. Graham), pp. 110-11.

Further letters.

February 28—

A Metrical Point in Chaucer (Fitzroy Pyle), p. 128.

Canterbury Tales, A 3483-6 and D 655-8: change in metre to mark proverbial saying.

March 7—

Edmund Spenser's Family and the Church (Dorothy F. Atkinson),

pp. 172-75.

Further note, March 28, p. 230.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 170, March 14—

Unrecorded XVIII. Century Plays (D. MacMillan), pp. 193-95.

Comments on and corrections of Mr. F. T. Wood's list, from the Larpent MSS.

— March 21—

Chaucer Allusions (Dorothy F. Atkinson), p. 207.

By Mathias Prideaux and Lady Mary Wortley Montague.

Rural Setting in the Drama : an Early Example (R. C. Boys), p. 207.

Charles Johnson's *Country Lasses*, 1714.The *Parthenon* (A. J. H.), p. 213.

Further note by R. S. Forsythe, April 11, p. 265.

— March 27—

"Long Oyster" (Harold B. Allen), p. 227.

Origin and early uses of name ; notes by C. T. Onions, L. M. Anstey, and E. J. G. Forse, April 11, pp. 264-65.

— April 4—

"Fielding" in Dickens (T. J. Bradley), p. 244.

Reference in *Pickwick* to Thomas Fielding's *Select Proverbs*.

— April 25—

Mysteries of London (W. Roberts), pp. 294-95.Another imitation of Sue's *Mysteries of Paris*.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XV., January 1936—

Herman Melville in the Marquesas (R. S. Forsythe), pp. 1-15.

Yarn for Melville's *Typee* (Russell Thomas), pp. 16-29.

Emerson as a Critic of Fiction (J. T. Flanagan), pp. 30-45.

The Popularity of English Travel Books about the Near East, 1775-1825 (W. C. Brown), pp. 70-80.

Symbolic Color in the Literature of the English Renaissance (D. C. Allen), pp. 81-92.

The Date of Milton's Blindness (J. Milton French), pp. 93-94.

Evidence of Mylius' diary : end of February, 1651/2.

Milton and the Politicians (J. Milton French), pp. 94-95.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. LI., March 1936—

On the Study of Old English Syntax (G. W. Small), pp. 1-7.

The Gawain Poet and Dante : A Conjecture (G. H. Gerould), pp. 31-36.

Choice of dialect influenced by *Il Convivio* ?Skelton's *Speak, Parrot* (W. Nelson), pp. 59-82.

Lawes' Version of Shakespeare's Sonnet CXVI. (W. McC. Evans), pp. 120-22.

Three six-line stanzas and tune, in John Gamble's commonplace book of songs.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 383

Dramatic Advertisements in the Burney Newspapers, 1660-1700 (Sybil Rosenfeld), pp. 123-52.

The Dating of Congreve's Letters (J. C. Hodges), pp. 153-64.

The publication of Chesterfield's *Letters to his Son* (S. L. Gulick, Jr.), pp. 165-77.

The Correspondents (Rose M. Davis), pp. 207-20.

Lord Lyttelton and Mrs. Peach: authenticity of correspondence.

Ludwig Tieck as a Translator of English (E. H. Zeydel), pp. 221-42.

A Chronological List of Emerson's Lectures on his British Lecture Tour of 1847-1848 (Townsend Scudder, 3rd), pp. 243-48.

Man and Animals in Recent Poetry (Elizabeth Atkins), pp. 263-83.

The Chronology of Bishop Brunton's Sermons (Mary A. Devlin), pp. 299-302.

A Note on Source-Studies of *St. Patrick for Ireland* (H. MacMullan), p. 302.

The Poet in Shelley's *Alastor*: A Criticism and a Reply (M. Kessel; P. Mueschke and E. L. Griggs), pp. 302-12.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. XIII., February 1936—

Tartuffe and the "Optique du Théâtre" (E. E. Stoll), pp. 193-214.

Comparison with Falstaff. Notes by E. Legouis and L. Cazamian, pp. 214-18.

Le jeu de l'Amour et de l'Amitié dans *Le Marchand de Venise* (A. Digeon), pp. 219-31.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIII., April 1936—

Nicholas Breton's *The Works of a Young Wit* (1577) (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 119-33.

Du Bartas' Use of Lucretius (Virgil K. Whitaker), pp. 134-46.

Spenser's Reading: The *De Claris Muliebus* (Rosemond Tuve), pp. 147-65.

A New Source for Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Book I. (Isabel E. Rathbone), pp. 166-81.

The Sermon "Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion," in the *Second Book of Homilies*.

Sir Walter Raleigh's Marriage (Fred Sorenson), pp. 182-202.

Who and What were the Cathayans? (Y. Z. Chang), pp. 203-21.

Cant term used in various meanings.

"Waterish Burgundy" (R. A. Law), pp. 222-27.

Burgundy's part in *King Lear*, and the part played by Burgundy in English history.

Woodward's Debt to Milton in 1644 (George W. Whiting), pp. 228-35.

Woodward's *Dialogue*.

Milton, Needham, and *Mercurius Politicus* (J. Milton French), pp. 236-52.

Needham's authorship of the leaders; notices of Milton and his works.

- Milton's Conception of the Ruler (Don. M. Wolfe), pp. 253-72.
 Dryden's Criticism of Shakespeare (J. O. Eidson), pp. 273-80.
 Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (Hardin Craig,
 D. Patrick and W. Wells), pp. 283-396.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, February 1, 1936—

- Coleridge on *Robinson Crusoe* (F. D. Klingender), p. 96.
 Original version of annotations in Mr. Gillman's copy.
 A Donne Poem ? (I. A. Shapiro ; E. K. Chambers), p. 96.
 Arguments against Donne's authorship of verses to Captain John Smith.
 Reply by B. H. Newdigate, February 8, p. 116 ; note by R. B. Botting,
 March 14, p. 224.
 Shakespeare Allusion (P. Beattie Mitchell), p. 96.
 In *Mercurius Britannicus*, 26 August-2 September, 1644.
Arden of Feversham (V. Scholderer), p. 96.
 "Cloys" a misreading of Oldys' signature ?

February 8—

- Manuscripts of the *Ancren Riwele* (Hope Emily Allen), p. 116.
 Problems connected with their provenance.
 Spenser's Ireland Dialogue (R. Gottfried), p. 116.
 The source of notes on Ireland in the Carew Manuscripts.
 Thomas Sackville (Percy Allen ; R. L. Lloyd), p. 116.

February 15—

- Daniel, the Pope and the Devil : A Caricaturist's Portrait of the
 True Defoe (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 134.
 The Staging of *Romeo and Juliet* (J. C. Adams), p. 139.
 Further letters by H. Granville-Barker and G. Sampson, February 22,
 p. 163 ; by W. J. Lawrence, February 29, p. 184.
 James Hogg's Birthday (A. L. Strout), p. 139.
 Uncertainty in his own references.
 A Poem by Lionel Johnson (A. Shacksnovis), p. 139.
 MS. inscription in book given to A. Ferrand.
 Marlowe and Chrysostom (John Searle), p. 139.
 "Ten thousand Hells."

February 29—

- English in Dublin (W. F. Trench), p. 184.
 Survival of old words and meanings.
The Borderers and *The Ancient Mariner* (A. Beatty), p. 184.
 Parallel in the Harleian Miscellany, Vol. VII.
 Francis Bacon's Mother (Florence E. Teager), p. 184.
 Letters and documents in the Ryerson collection.
A Mirror for Magistrates (Lily B. Campbell), p. 188.
 Bibliographical ; a reply to Fitzroy's Pyle's article of December 28.

6,

h.

g,

he

23,